

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Shelf....

BR 145 .B7813 1889 v.1
Brueck, Heinrich, 1831-1903
History of the Catholic
Church





HISTORY
OF
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.
FOR USE IN SEMINARIES AND COLLEGES.

By DR. HEINRICH BRUECK,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL SEMINARY OF MENTZ.

With Additions from the Writings
of
HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL HERGENROTHIER.

TRANSLATED
By REV. E. PRUENTE.

With an Introduction
BY RIGHT REV. MGR. JAMES A. CORCORAN, S.T.D.,
PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE, MORAL THEOLOGY, ETC., ETC.

VOL. I.

SECOND, REVISED, EDITION.

New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, & Einsiedeln:
BENZIGER BROTHERS,
PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE.
1889.

Imprimatur,

✠ PETRUS RICARDUS KENRICK,
Archiep. S. Lud.

S. LUDOVICI, die 5 Julii, A. D. 1884.

Copyright, 1884,
BY BENZIGER BROTHERS.

University Press:
JOHN WILSON AND SON, CAMBRIDGE.

TO

THE MOST REV. P. J. RYAN,
ARCHBISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA,

This Translation is Respectfully Dedicated,

IN MEMORY OF THE TIME WHEN, AS COADJUTOR TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF
ST. LOUIS, HIS ZEAL IN DEFENDING THE DOCTRINES, AND HIS ELOQUENCE
IN EXPLAINING THE PRACTICES, OF THE CHURCH, ATTRACTED
THE ADMIRATION OF

THE TRANSLATOR.

P R E F A C E.

THE Manual of Church History, the first volume of which is herewith presented to the English-speaking students of theology, and to the English-speaking community in general, is mainly a translation of the Church History of Dr. H. Brueck, Professor of Theology in the Ecclesiastical Seminary at Mentz.

Dr. Brueck's work has met with a most favorable recognition from learned reviewers in Germany and abroad. It is eminently fitted to serve as a text-book in colleges and seminaries, on which account it has been introduced into many Catholic institutions. A critic says: "To historic accuracy and scientific keenness, it unites an incomparable clearness and a conciseness that avoids everything superfluous, with a thoroughly ecclesiastical spirit and great precision when treating of doctrine."

The author, while endeavoring to give a truthful representation of the principal events occurring in the history of the Church, has bestowed his closest attention on such points as are of superior importance, treating more slightly the questions that are useful for specific studies, or such as are chiefly of interest to historical critics and to detailed research. Each individual subject has received a consideration suitable to its importance, and occupies a space proportionate to the extent of the whole book, which was designed to be a concise compendium.

The translator, while following Dr. Brueck's work as the basis and chief guide for this English edition, has introduced in the latter such changes as seemed required or commendable for English-speaking students, while he has forborne to transgress the limits assigned to a concise work. In making these changes,—whether additions or abbreviations,—he had recourse principally

to the historical researches of Cardinal Hergenröther; yet other reliable works — such as that of Alzog, translated by Pabish and Byrne — were occasionally consulted.

Respecting the multiplicity of notes annexed to the original, the wish has been frequently expressed that their number might be lessened, as many of them are of little practical utility for American students. Those, however, which bear testimony to important events, or which refer to doctrines specially contested or misrepresented by non-Catholics, or even such as seem to be of peculiar interest in themselves, have been retained, as, while not interfering with the steady march of the narrative, they have their own general value everywhere. References to historical sources and quotations from previous historians free the reader from the necessity of relying solely on the statements of one author ("jurare in verba magistri").

As the first edition of the work is to appear in two volumes, the division is made at the death of Pope Boniface VIII., because at this time a great change occurred in the exterior condition of the Church, and also because this division about equalizes the size of the two volumes. In the second volume the history of the Church in English-speaking countries will be duly extended, and an additional history of the Church in North America be given.

The whole has been reviewed and transcribed for the press by an English author of acknowledged reputation, that the book may be presented in a pure English idiom.

Finally, it may be mentioned that this translation was undertaken at the instance of those who had ample opportunities of perceiving the need of a fitting text-book of Church History in the English language.

The wish expressed by the original author that his book may continue to facilitate the important study of Church History, and to strengthen young theologians more and more in the love for Holy Mother Church, is fully indorsed, and its fulfilment ardently desired, by

THE TRANSLATOR.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION BY RIGHT REV. DR. CORCORAN	5
INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER	17
§ 1. Definition and Object of Church History; Sources whence it is derived; and Auxiliary Sciences	17
2. Literature of Ecclesiastical History	20

First Epoch.

PERIOD I.

FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

	PAGE
§ 3. State of Religion and Morality among the Jewish People	29
4. Lights and Shadows of Heathenism	32
5. Jesus Christ. — The God-Man. — Foundation of the Church	34
6. Pentecost. — Admission of Jews and Gentiles into the Church	39
7. Conversion and Apostolic Labors of St. Paul	40
8. Apostolic Labors of St. Peter and of the other Apostles	44
9. Dissolution of the Jewish Nation. — Destruction of Jerusalem	47
10. Spread of Christianity in the First Three Centuries	49
11. Causes of the Rapid Spread of Christianity. — Obstacles retarding its Progress	51

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

12. Condition of the Church in the Roman Empire. — Persecution of the Christians	54
13. Persecutions from Nero to Decius	54

	PAGE
§ 14. Persecutions from Decius to Diocletian	57
15. Christian Martyrdom	61
16. Scientific Attacks upon the Church by the Pagan Polemic Writers .	62
17. Defence of the Christian Religion by the Apologists	65

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

18. The Church. — Clergy and Laity. — Priests and Bishops	67
19. Election and Functions of the Bishops. — Other Ecclesiastical Offices. — Education and Support of the Clergy	71
20. The Authority of the Metropolitan Synods	72
21. The Primacy	73

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. THE FATHERS AND WRITERS OF THE CHURCH.

22. The Apostolic Fathers	81
23. The Christian Writers of the Second Century	83
24. The Christian Writers of the Third Century	84

2. HERESIES AND SCHISMS.

25. Judaizing Heretics	89
26. Gnosticism	90
27. Different Forms of Gnosticism	91
28. Manichæism	94
29. The Anti-Trinitarian Sect	96
30. The Montanists and the Alogi. — Chiliasm	98
31. Refutation of Heresies	99
32. Action and Teaching of the Church respecting Heresy	102

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

33. The Holy Sacraments. — Baptism and Confirmation. — Controversy on the Validity of Baptism when conferred by Heretics	103
34. Celebration of the Holy Eucharist	106
35. The Sacrament of Penance. — Penitential Discipline. — Schism of Felicissimus and Novatian	108
36. Matrimony. — The Discipline of the Secret	111
37. Sunday. — Ecclesiastical Feasts. — Contention concerning the Festival of Easter	112
38. Fast Days. — Places of Worship. — Life of the Christians	114

PERIOD II.

FROM THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE THE GREAT TO THE SIXTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (680).

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY.

	PAGE
§ 39. Christianity in the Individual Countries of Asia	117
40. The Christian Church in Africa	119

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

41. Paganism under Constantine the Great and his Sons	119
42. Attempt at the Revival of Paganism under Julian the Apostate	121
43. The Succeeding Emperors.—Gradual Extinction of Paganism	123
44. Polemies of the Pagans	124
45. Christian Apologists	126
46. Relations of the State to the Church.—Influence of Christianity on Legislation	128
47. Rights and Privileges of the Church	129
48. Influence of the State on the Interior Condition of the Church	130

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

49. Increase in the Number of Ecclesiastical Officers.—Education and Support of the Clergy	132
50. Celibacy	133
51. Bishops, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs	136
52. The Primacy	139
Chronological Record of the Popes in the Second Period of the First Epoch	143
53. Ecumenical Councils	149

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

I. THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

54. The Oriental Fathers	151
55. The Fathers of the West	155

2. HERESIES AND SCHISMS.

	PAGE
§ 56. The Donatist Schism.— Schism of Meletius	159
57. Trinitarian Conflicts.— Arianism	162
58. Arianism under Constantius.— Splits among the Arians: the Anomœans and the Semi-Arians	166
59. Arianism in its Decline.— The Luciferian and Meletian Schism.— Apollinarians and Macedonians	169
60. Gnostic-Manichæan Heresies.— Priscillianists and Paulicians . .	171
61. Controversies respecting Salvation (Soteriological).— Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism	172
62. Christological Controversies; or, Controversies respecting the Person of Christ.— Nestorianism	178
63. Monophysitism	181
64. The Origenist Controversy, and the Quarrel on the Three Chapters	187
65. Monothelitism	191

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

66. Holy Baptism, Confirmation, and Eucharist	199
67. Penance.— Extreme Unction.— Ordination.— Matrimony . . .	203
68. Churches and their Ornaments.— Liturgical Vestments . . .	204
69. Veneration of Saints.— Pilgrimages and Processions . . .	208
70. Fasting-Days.— Charitable Institutions.— Christian Life . .	211
71. Monasticism	213
72. Retrospect	215

Second Epoch.

PERIOD I.

FROM THE MIGRATION OF NATIONS TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII. (1073).

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

	PAGE
§ 73. Migration of Nations	217
74. Christianity among the Goths.— Condition of the Church in Gaul and Spain	218
75. Condition of the Church among the Vandals in Africa	220
76. The Church among the Burgundians.— Ravages of the Huns . .	221

	PAGE
§ 77. Condition of the Church in Italy among the Ostrogoths and the Lombards	222
78. Conversion of the Franks	223
79. Christianity in the British Isles	224
80. Christianity in Germany	231
81. Labors of St. Boniface	233
82. Conversion of the Saxons and the Avari	237
83. Christianity in the North of Europe	239
84. Christianity among the Slavonic Nations. — Conversion of the Magyars	242
85. Mahometanism	247

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

86. Establishment of the States of the Church	249
87. The Apostolic See and Charlemagne. — The Roman Empire of the West	252
88. The Popes and the Carlovingians	254
89. Tenth Century. — Condition of the Apostolic See. — The Saxon Emperors	258
90. The Popes and the Frankish Emperors up to the Time of Gregory VII.	263
91. Political Position of the Prelates. — Advantages and Disadvantages of this Position in regard to the Church	267
92. Royal Messengers. — Church Property. — Guardians of Churches and Monasteries	269

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

93. The Bishop and his Diocese. — Origin of the Cathedral and Collegiate Chapters. — Cardinals	270
94. Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals	273
95. The Primacy. — Power and Influence of the Popes	275
96. Meritorious Influence of the Apostolic See on Ecclesiastical Discipline. — Religious Affairs in Various Countries of Europe	277
97. The Order of St. Benedict	282

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. SCHOOLS OF LEARNING.

98. State of Knowledge before Charlemagne	284
99. Learning under Charlemagne and his Successors	286

2. HERESIES AND SCHISMS.

	PAGE
§ 100. Controversy respecting Images	291
101. The Greek Schism	295
102. Adoptionism	299
103. The Heresy of Gottschalk	301
104. Controversy on the Holy Eucharist	302

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

105. The Holy Sacraments.—Ecclesiastical Punishments	305
106. Veneration of the Saints	307
107. The Clergy	308
108. Christian Life	309

PERIOD II.

FROM GREGORY VII. TO THE SO-CALLED REFORMATION.

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

109. The Crusades	312
110. Christianity in the Interior of Asia, especially in the Empire of the Mongols	316
111. Christianity in the West.—Conversion of the Pomeranians and of other Slavonic Tribes	317
112. Christianity among the Finnish-Lettish Tribes.—Conversion of the Lithuanians	318
113. Attempts to convert the Mahometans.—Fate of the Jews	320

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

1. TO THE PONTIFICATE OF BONIFACE VIII., INCLUSIVE (1303).

114. Struggles of the Popes for the Liberty of the Church.—Gregory VII.—Renewal of the Laws against Simony and Concubinage.—Contest concerning Investitures	323
115. Continuation of the Struggle.—Successors of Gregory VII.—Concordat of Worms	330
116. Double Elections.—Disturbances at Rome	333
117. Contests of the Apostolic See with the Cæsarian Papism of the Hohenstaufens.—Popes Adrian and Alexander III. in Conflict with Frederic I.	335

	PAGE
§ 118. Conflicts with the Church in England under William II. and Henry II.—The Archbishops Anselm and Thomas à Becket	340
119. The Relation which the Hohenstaufens bore to the Church, under the Successors of Alexander III.	344
120. Pope Innocent III.	345
121. Conflict of the Popes Honorius III., Gregory IX., and Innocent IV., with the Emperor Frederic II.	350
122. The Popes from Innocent IV. to Boniface VIII.—Fall of the Hohenstaufens.—Interregnum.—French Influence on the Apostolic See	354
123. The Pontificate of Boniface VIII.	358
124. Retrospect	366
<hr/>	
Chronological List of Popes from St. Peter to Boniface VIII.	369
Chronological List of Ecumenical Councils from the First Council of Nice to the Second Council of Lyons	371
Chronological Table of Popes, Emperors, and Important Events, from St. Peter to Boniface VIII.	373

INTRODUCTION.

IT may be safely set down as a self-evident proposition, needing no proof, for none will venture to deny it, at least in theory, that if history is to be, what the prince of Pagan eloquence styles it, “a trustworthy witness, shedding light on past events,” it must be written truthfully and honestly; otherwise the writer, whatever be his chosen historic field, not only fails in his duty, but becomes a false teacher. If this be true in narrating the merely secular annals of a country or people, how much more, when it is a question of chronicling the life and vicissitudes upon earth of the Church founded by Christ our Lord. In this case partiality and prejudice may not only make of the historian a blind guide as to accurate knowledge of facts, but (what is far worse) may lead him, intentionally or not, to revile holy things, to slander God’s saints, to blaspheme and teach error, that not only darkens the intellect, but may work the ruin of immortal souls.

Yet, if we are to believe a distinguished Protestant authority,¹ who has made a name for himself in philosophy and letters, the impartiality essential to the composition of Church History has not been yet attained by any writer, Catholic or Protestant. He distinctly affirms that “Church History has not been yet written, as alone written it ought to be, with truth and knowledge.” “Church History” (he appropriately adds), “falsely written, is a school of vainglory, hatred, and uncharitableness; truly written, it is a discipline of humility, of charity, of mutual love.” Now, with all due respect to the illustrious dialectician, it is to be feared that he has drawn his sweeping general assertion from

¹ *Sir William Hamilton* : Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform. Second London Ed., p. 505.

particular data, which warrant no such conclusion. The key-note of his reasoning may be found in this passage, which follows soon after: “In a moral relation, perhaps, more than any other, the history of Luther and the Reformation has been written only as a conventional romance, and I know not whether Catholics or Protestants have wandered widest from the line of truth.”

To illustrate his position, the Scotch philosopher then proceeds mercilessly to dissect—what he proves by direct quotation, and what he intimates has been so long and so artfully concealed, or slurred over, by Luther’s biographers and panegyrists—the “extravagancies” into which the founder of the new religion “was betrayed by an assurance of his personal inspiration, of which he was, indeed, no less confident than of his ability to perform miracles. He disclaimed the Pope, he spurned the Church, but varying in almost all else, he never doubted of his own infallibility. He thus piously regarded himself as the authoritative judge both of the meaning and of the authenticity of Scripture.” He mentions besides, amongst the things studiously ignored by modern admirers of the Reformer, though candidly acknowledged by Luther himself, “the fearful dissolution of morals that began and long prevailed after the religious revolution in Protestant Germany”; of which corruption, he says, there were “two principal *foci*, Wittemberg and Hesse”—the former the home of Luther and the chief school of his teaching, often denounced by himself and fellow-preachers as a new “Sodom” and “the devil’s own stinking sewer”—the other, Hesse, whose prince was an ardent disciple of Luther, and whose leading University, Marburg, as we are told by an eye-witness (Rudolph Walter), had for tutelary deities, not Apollo and Minerva, but Bacchus and Venus. In further confirmation of his assertion, Sir William relates the dispensing process by which Luther, Melanthon and other divines of Wittemberg and Hesse allowed the Landgrave to take an additional wife—sacrificing by this vile, “skulking compromise” (as he had justly called it in a previous edition) Gospel morality and eternal truth to temporary expediency.

It would be unreasonable to find fault with the Scotch philosopher for complaining that these points of Protestant history have been carefully suppressed by older Protestant writers, and, when further concealment became impossible, have been either

lightly touched on, artfully disguised, or elaborately explained away. This is especially seen in the fact last mentioned, the Landgrave's bigamy and Luther's share in it. Almost to the present day the crime has been diligently travestied, so as to retain scarcely a trace of its original foulness by English-speaking Protestants of every hue, Evangelical and Anglican. One of the latter, Archdeacon Hare, considered it such a vital issue for Protestantism, that he seems to have felt it a duty to strain his conscience and become "*splendide mendax*" in defense of Luther and the Landgrave, against the charges of Bossuet and Sir Wm. Hamilton. As to Catholic historians, if they had to content themselves with denouncing Luther and his princely client on general principles and with the aid of only a few well-authenticated facts, it was because the details of this whole infamous transaction were as cautiously hidden from them, as they were from impartial Protestants. However disposed to shun "conventional romance" and tell the truth, how could Sir William expect them in this case to do it "with knowledge"? An honest Protestant, Bretschneider, while preparing his edition of Melancthon's Works, applied to the Hessian government for leave to examine the state archives and publish the original documents connected with the Landgrave's bigamy. The permission was refused. Even a sight of the documents was denied him. "Mihi roganti inspicere acta non licuit," as he himself complains in his preliminary remarks to the famous "*Bedenken*" of Luther and the Wittemberg divines (Opera Melancthonis, Halis Sax., vol. iii, col. 851). They called it a *Bedenken* (opinion), which mild term has been turned to advantage by the sophistry of some modern admirers of Luther; but De Wette honestly calls it by its true name, "die Dispensation" (Luther's Briefe, Berlin, 1828, vol. v, p. 236). Non-Catholics are disposed to complain that the Pope and the Church are afraid of historical truth, and on that account stow it away in inaccessible hiding-places. This is disproved sufficiently by the conduct of our Holy Father, Leo XIII., who has freely opened to all students the rich stores of the Vatican library. But the fact we have alleged clearly shows that there are Protestant rulers who are anxious to check investigation by locking up the sources of truth—and this, too, in a matter most important in its bearings on the moral and doctrinal develop-

ments of early Protestantism. Nor does there appear any ground for hoping that the Prussian government, which has succeeded the Hessian authorities in the ownership of those archives, has not succeeded them also in unwillingness to make those treasures accessible to inquirers after historical truth.

From the course of reasoning adopted by the distinguished author from whom we have quoted, it is quite evident that, to save his logic, we must suppose him to consider the Reformation and its consequences to be such a great, all-absorbing portion of Ecclesiastical History, that by the side of it all the rest sinks into utter insignificance. This is a great mistake, to say the least. The religious revolution of the sixteenth century in Germany and England may be all-important in the eyes of Protestants, because from it dates the existence of the Protestant church (or churches) and the beginning of the ecclesiastical annals of Protestantism, till then unheard-of and unknown. But in the judgment of the Church of Ages, from which Protestantism is only a revolt, the history of the latter has no more right to be called the history of Christ's Church than has the history of Gnosticism, Arianism, or of any of the old heresies. Nay, in her eyes the history of Arianism which, backed by all the powers of earth and hell, labored long and with desperate energy, and, had it not been for God's promises, would have succeeded at last in destroying her fundamental dogma, the Divinity of Christ, is much more serious and eventful than the history of Protestantism, which was merely the outcome of ambition, rapacity, and lust on the part of princes and nobles, and of the spirit of revived Paganism in all classes. Moreover, the Church of nineteen centuries must necessarily look upon the life of Protestantism as that of an infant, when compared not only with her own venerable age, but even with the length of days of which such effete heresies as Nestorianism and Eutychianism may boast. Whatever historical weight the Reformation may possess is derived from its consequences rather than from its doctrines. Illogical and indefensible in its principles and creeds, it has, nevertheless, eaten its way like a cancer into the very heart and life of modern society, and has opened the gates to the contempt and hatred of the supernatural, the scepticism and unbelief that are now desolating Europe and America, and threaten the return of

that barbarism from which the Church once before rescued the world.

But granting even what is alleged or quietly supposed, that the history of Luther and of Protestantism is the only all-important part of Church History, it by no means follows that Catholic historians should lack either the ability or the will to treat it with "truth and knowledge"; and the Scotch philosopher's statement, so far as it relates to them, is groundless both in the implied logic and the asserted fact. If not recreant to their own religious principles, they cannot but regard the Reformer's breach of his monastic vows as a sacrilege, his teachings, doctrinal and practical, as to the impossibility of continence, the lawfulness of divorce and polygamy, as contrary to the Gospel and subversive of all Christian morality; his defiance of Church authority as the rebellion of a proud, ambitious, ungovernable spirit, scorning submission to any higher power, while unsparingly exacting it from all for himself and his changing opinions. Why, then, should they not express themselves to that effect. Did they write in an angry, intemperate spirit or strive to thrust upon the world their own private opinion, it would be wrong; but there can be no harm in allowing their language, otherwise calm and passionless, to be influenced by what they know to be infallible truth, divinely revealed. They do not invent, suppress, or alter facts; they only pass judgment on them. For the mass of readers that judgment may seem correct or not, and each one will accept or reject it accordingly; he has always the facts before him by which to shape his course and draw his own conclusions.

Who will venture to affirm that Bossuet has not written the dogmatic history of Protestant belief and its ever-varying creeds honestly and accurately, or, as Sir William phrases it, with truth and knowledge? Who will deny the same praise to Döllinger, who has traced faithfully the growth and results of the Réformation, not only from the doctrinal but also from the moral and social point of view? To secure an impartiality which cannot be called in question, he carefully abstains from quoting Catholic writers. His authorities are exclusively Protestant, and for the most part the very authors, heralds, and promoters of the New Gospel. He describes in their own words the fearful torrent of impiety, vice, and corruption that flowed from the Reformation,

as effect flows from cause, and which were so glaring and deadly that good-minded men everywhere stood aghast at the sight of this moral pestilence, which threatened the extinction of all religion, and of social order itself. Döllinger's work¹ is written in a cold, dry, unimpassioned style, which is one of the best tokens of the author's impartiality. Yet, if this does not invite readers, it is not sufficient to repel them. And no unprejudiced Protestant, we make bold to say, can rise from its perusal and remain for an instant under the delusion that the Reformation was God's work any more than the bloody persecution of Nero, the hideous excesses of the French Revolution, or the final coming of Anti-christ.

Besides these and others we could mention, Germany can boast in our own day of an illustrious Catholic author, who has given to the world a history of Protestantism, its origin, its progress, and its final establishment as the dominant religion through many parts of Germany, from the shores of the Baltic and Northern Sea to the borders of France and Italy. No one, Protestant or Catholic, in his own country would dream of charging *him* with writing a conventional romance. Not inferior to Bossuet and Döllinger in truthfulness and honesty, he surpasses them in knowledge, because he has the good fortune of having access (which they could not have) to the many hitherto unpublished sources of information, that have been drawn in late years from the archives of Rome, France, Spain, Germany, and the Low Countries. He writes, therefore, with as full a knowledge of his subject as can be attained in our day, and with a rare impartiality that has extorted the admiration alike of friend and foe. We allude to Dr. Johannes Janssen, author of the History of the German People,² of which four volumes have already appeared, bringing the narrative of events from the end of the mediæval period down to the year 1588. The leading journals and reviews of Germany have extolled his work as the beginning of a new epoch in the writing of German History. No enemy has dared to accuse him of suppressing or altering facts, or of

¹ Die Reformation: ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkungen im Umfange des lutherischen Bekenntnisses. 3 Bde. Regensburg, 1846-48.

² Geschichte des deutschen Volkes, seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Freiburg im Breisgau (Herder), 1883-85.

giving way to his imagination, either to befriend the Catholic or disparage the Protestant cause. Even the few critics (Kostlin, Baumgartner, and others), who have ventured to attack the author as a partisan, have signally failed to detract in the least from the merits of his work. The weapons they brought to bear upon their adversary, bigotry, noisy abuse, and dishonest quotation, were so shameful and notorious, and his noble, dispassionate replies so crushing, that their attacks have only served to show, in fuller light, the excellence of his history. It would be highly desirable that some scholar, who has the ability and leisure to undertake the task, should give the English-speaking world a translation of Janssen's historical work. It would be an invaluable guide to a true knowledge of the facts of modern German history, and especially of the Reformation, facts deliberately suppressed or ingeniously perverted by so many writers.

As far as it relates to Protestant historians, the charge made against them by Sir Wm. Hamilton of distorting and perverting the history of Protestantism, of turning it into "a conventional romance," in other words, of being leagued together in what De Maistre calls a "grand conspiracy against the truth," is unhappily too well founded. They are painfully conscious that any attempt to justify, or much worse, to find matter of praise in the way the Reformers accomplished their work, if this were honestly told, would be a task not only arduous but impossible, and would disgust every upright Christian reader. The Reformation was born of lust, greed, and ambition; it grew and triumphed by bloodshed and crime. Under the false mask of religious liberty it was forced upon unwilling peoples by riotous mobs, or by the power of the state, by edicts of the fiercest intolerance. In England, the yoke of the New Gospel was imposed on a reluctant population by a foreign soldiery. These, as Hallam ingenuously acknowledges, are shameful charges, which cannot be refuted. How, in the name of religion and of common sense, is an unprejudiced reader to be made believe that all this wickedness was the work of God? And that having a world of existing and possible creatures to draw upon, he should choose such vile instruments, such abominable means to accomplish His divine counsels, reform His erring Church, deeply sunk in idolatry and superstition, and bring the knowledge of revealed truth, that had utterly vanished,

back again into the world? The historian who makes the attempt to prove this, deserves our pity, especially if he narrate with candor the excesses of the Reformers and their first disciples. But when, instead of attempting to excuse or palliate them, he either suppresses all mention of the same, or studiously gives them such a false coloring that they lose all trace of what was criminal or disgraceful, and serve to adorn and glorify the work of the Reformers, disgust and horror must take the place of pity. Yet this is, we are sorry to say, the conventional style of Protestant historians, not only of Bale ("too great a liar to be believed," as Rev. Mr. Wharton calls him), Mathesius, Burnett, Mosheim, and a host of others, but almost of all. There seems to be scarcely one of them, outside the number of blind copyists, who is not thoroughly versed in the art of inventing, altering, and suppressing facts, of garbling quotations and of skillfully manipulating authorities, so as to extract from them the very opposite of what they really say. Those who have shown any candor and honesty are unfortunately so few that they may be almost counted on one's fingers. Among them may be mentioned G. J. Plank, in his Confessional History¹ and the Pietist, Gottfried Arnold.² The volumes of Arnold gave a new impulse, and in the right direction, to the study of the true history of the Reformation. If not thoroughly impartial, as the title professes (there are in him a good many prejudiced notions when he speaks of the Church), it was, we believe, an honest attempt to be such, and should be honored accordingly. Even Rationalists and unbelievers, though entertaining as little respect for Christianity in its Lutheran, or in its Catholic form, as they have for Buddhism, are yet so blinded by affection and reverence for Luther, because they regard him as the legitimate father of all free-thinkers, that they are unable to write impartially of him and of the religious revolution of which he was the author.

As regards the history of the nineteen centuries that have passed since Christ founded His Church upon earth, while it is

¹ Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veränderungen und der Bildung unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs vom Anfange der Reformation bis zur Einführung der Concordienformel. Leipzig, 1781-1800. Six volumes.

² Unpartheiische Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie vom Anfang des neuen Testamentes bis auf das Jahr Christi 1688. Frankfurt, 1699. Two volumes fo.

true that it has been written partially and perversely by many, both Catholics and Protestants, still it cannot be affirmed as a general proposition that no author has ever treated it impartially, and that it remains yet to be written, as it should be, with truth and knowledge. As far as Protestant historians are concerned, it is but natural that they should feel little disposed to treat fairly sundry points of early Church History. To give an example, the early Church abhorred and condemned as heretics Aerius, Vigilantius, and Jovinian. Now, these men horrified the Christian world by uttering in the very words of to-day some of the cardinal doctrines of Protestantism. They taught that there is no difference between priests and bishops, that the Blessed Virgin, the Saints and Martyrs are not worthy of honor and veneration, much less their relics, being only "dead men's bones," no more entitled to respect than any other fragment of earthly clay. How is it possible for a modern heretic to refuse his sympathy to his predecessors, who advocate his doctrines in the very words that he habitually uses, or how can he avoid feelings of bitterness against the Church that condemned them fourteen or fifteen centuries ago as vigorously and unsparingly as she does to-day? Even in the case of other heretics, Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Photius, etc., who broached new dogmas which he does not receive, the Protestant historian, though he refuse to accept their teaching, will, nevertheless, by irresistible impulse, as experience shows, feel attracted to them personally, because they uttered their new dogmas on the strength of the great Protestant principle—private judgment and defiance of Church authority.

As regards Catholics, it is simply slanderous to say that none of them have written Church History, as it should be written, honestly and impartially. The Annals of Baronius, with Pagi's critical remarks, and the great work of the Bollandists are sufficient to disprove the accusation. Baronius has told so faithfully all the evil narrated of the Popes by Luitprand and other scandalous chroniclers of the so-called Dark Ages, that both himself and Bellarmine have been rebuked for their credulity by modern critics, Catholic and Protestant. We have undeniably some Catholic historians who have sacrificed truth to partisan feeling, to private passion, or to earthly interests. But who are they? The Luit-

prands, Matthew Parises, Fleurys, Racines, and others whom good Catholics hold in detestation, but whom the Protestant world applauds, honors, and almost claims as its own.¹ The temptation to enlarge on this topic is great, but it would be out of place in these preliminary remarks.

The work of Rev. Dr. Brück, which is now for the first time presented to our readers in an English translation, fulfils all the conditions of a good, substantial Church History, which will be satisfactory both to students and to ordinary readers. It has been highly commended by all the leading magazines of Catholic Germany. The author is brief and succinct, because his intention was to provide a solid treatise for students, and, at the same time, by excluding prolixity and copiousness of detail, to furnish a suitable book for general reading. It will be found on examination that Dr. Brück's book answers well this two-fold purpose, and that, while much has been condensed into a small space, nothing of real importance has been overlooked.

The author, as any one competent to judge may readily discover in reading his pages, is not disposed to be over-credulous, which (it may be allowed) was a fault of some of our earlier modern historians. Indeed, some of those who are outside of the Church, and seem to think that true religion consists mainly, if not solely, in hating and reviling her and everything belonging to her, either believe, or pretend to believe, that an excess of credulity is a distinctive mark of Catholic historians. This only shows their little or no acquaintance with the great Catholic critics of the last three centuries. The names of Pagi, Tillemont, Papebroke, Muratori, and the Maurine monks, not to mention a hundred others, must be absolutely unknown to these shallow-minded men. There is a criticism born of heresy and rationalism,

¹ To mention only one of them, the Lutheran, Gruber, in his Preface to the Latin translation of Fleury's "Institutiones Canonicee" (Francofurti et Lipsiæ, 1724), says of the famous history of this unprincipled Gallican and Regalist: "He (Fleury) is full of good sentiments; for he speaks of the Roman primacy in such equivocal style that he seems bent on destroying rather than establishing it (eum ut magis destruere quam astruere videatur); and there is no doubt that our people (Protestants) should reckon him among the most important witnesses to the (Protestant) truth that have lived in our day." Apud Marchetti, Critica della Storia Ecclesiastica del Sig. Abate Claudio Fleury, Roma, 1819. Pref., p. vi.

eager and skilled to pull down and destroy, but not knowing how to build. This, however, is not true criticism, but its counterfeit ; and on this Catholic writers do not pride themselves. It is incompatible with that sincere love of truth which is the first duty of an honest historian. In choosing the great critics who are to be his guides, Dr. Brück aims only at justice and truth, and, like them, never exceeds the bounds of moderation.

The work, in our opinion, will make an excellent text-book for our ecclesiastical seminaries. In the first place, it possesses the merit of clearness and order, two things most necessary in a text-book. In the next place it is well adapted for both teacher and student. In too many manuals and class-books, the student is treated to a superabundance of proofs and introduced to the knowledge of intricate objections, as if he were competent to decide for himself and needed no teacher. This is not as it should be. The student's judgment is yet unripe ; hence, something must be left for the teacher to do, and his authority must have its weight in influencing and guiding those whom he teaches. We should be careful not to destroy or weaken the legitimate relation that exists between master and disciple, but retain it unimpaired and cherish it, especially in our Catholic schools. It was a tie that closely bound the sages of Greece and Rome with their scholars ; it is found even in non-Catholic schools, where it lives in practice by the side and in spite of the silly theory that clamors for private judgment in all matters that concern Religion. With such a text-book as Dr. Brück's, the Professor, if he judge fit, can enlarge on one subject more than another, and can supplement its treatment by adducing new proofs, or by further development of those indicated in the text or notes. And the scholar, when he is no longer such, but a student in the fullest sense of the word, when his judgment is matured after college or seminary life, if he has leisure and inclination for such studies, can consult the authorities in their original source, and summon to his aid the writers of more ponderous tomes, who have thoroughly treated each subject.

The translation, on the whole, is remarkably well executed. We may object, however, to its servile following of German usage in translating proper names. Some of these have been already naturalized amongst us in an English form, as : Martin,

Innocent, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, etc. These necessarily supersede all pure Latin and Greek forms. Where the names have not acquired an English form, the rule is to give them unchanged in their original shape, and not arbitrarily curtail them. Hence, we must say: Hippolytus, Cerinthus, Adrumetum; and not: Hippolyte, Cerinth, and Adrumet. There are also a few periods in which the German idiom has been so carefully retained as to interfere with the sense. But these are slight faults and will be eliminated, no doubt, in a second edition, which this excellent work cannot fail to attain, since several seminaries of our country have expressed their intention of adopting it in their course of studies for the coming scholastic year.

JAMES ANDREW CORCORAN, D.D.

ST. CHARLES SEMINARY,
OVERBROOK, PA.,
August 25, 1885.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

§ 1. *Definition and Object of Church History; Sources whence it is derived; and Auxiliary Sciences.*

THE Church is the kingdom of God on earth: it was instituted by Jesus Christ, and is directed by the Holy Ghost. The object of it is to purify man from sin, and to reunite him to God, his ultimate aim and end. It is not *of* this world, but *for* this world, and contains within itself a *divine* and a *human* element; the latter only admits of change and development.

It follows from this that the History of the Church must be a description of the manner and way in which this kingdom of God has spread itself over the earth, while unfolding more and more of its interior life by outward expression.

Therefore the object of Church history is to portray the spread of Christianity in the relation it bears to the various people on the earth's surface; as also to depict the interior development of the Church in regard to constitution, doctrine, and worship, as far as it is possible so to do.

In accordance with this view, we shall first consider the *exterior relationships* of the Church, namely, those which record its expansion and its connection with individual states; and then proceed to the *interior relationships*, — those which concern the ecclesiastical constitutions, the development of doctrine, of worship, and discipline.

In regard to time, Church history is divided into three epochs: —

The first epoch comprises principally the action and influence of the Church within the Roman Empire: it extends from the first foundation of the Church until the end of the controversy with the Monothelites (A. D. 680).

The second epoch has for its special object the deeds effected and the influence exercised by the Church among the various German

and Slavonic tribes. It begins with the migration of these tribes, and continues to the schism concerning faith in the sixteenth century.

The third epoch extends from the sixteenth century to the present era.

In order to fulfil its scope, Church history must be at once *critical*, *pragmatical*, and *theological*. The historian should rigidly examine the sources whence he derives his information, that he may be able to distinguish the true from the false; he must trace the interior connection of separate events, and finally set the facts of history in the light of faith, by pointing to the higher, the divine guidance of the Church manifested therein.¹

The very definition and object of Church history proclaim its value and importance. It is important for every Christian, but more especially for the theologian, not only on account of its subject, which is of intrinsic value, but also because it is the record of the development of the kingdom of God, and as such is related to dogmatic theology, to canon law, and other branches of theological discipline,²—each and all of which require an accurate knowledge of the history of the Church.

The sources of Church history are partly *divine*,—these sources are the Holy Scriptures,—partly *human*; which last are either *direct*, as original documents, narratives from eye-witnesses, inscriptions, and monuments; or *indirect*, as the compilations by later historians of *public* and *private*, of *written* or of *oral*, testimony. Before availing himself of these sources, the historian should examine their authenticity and integrity, besides assuring himself of the trustworthiness of their authors.

The principal auxiliary sciences to Church history are ecclesiastical philology;³ diplomatics, or the art of reading ancient writings,⁴ also called paleography; chronology,⁵ geography,⁶ and archaeology;⁷ the histories of philosophy and of literature, together with universal history.

The prevailing mode of computing time is the *aera Christiana* (Christian era), commencing with the birth of Christ, which was introduced by Dionysius Exiguus (Denys the Little), (see § 77). Besides this may be noted the *aera Constantinopolitana*, which computes the years from the creation of the world (1 Sept., 5508 B. C.). This was produced in the seventh century, and was used in the Greek Church. The *aera Seleucidarum* (reckoning from 1 Oct., 312 or 311 B. C.), which is still used in Syria. The *aera Hispanica* (1 Jan.,

38 B. C.) was used in Spain up to the fourteenth century. The aera Diocletiana, or martyrum (29 Aug., 284, ref. 23 Feb., 303 A. D.). The computation of time from the building of Rome (754 B. C.), and according to the Roman consulate and post-consulate years. The Cyclus indictionum (Roman tax number), introduced from the time of Constantine the Great, every fifteen years. There were three different indictions: the indiction Constantiana or imperialis (24 Sept., 312 A. D.), Constantinopolitana (1 Sept.), and Romana or pontificalis (25 Dec. or 1 Jan., 3 B. C.). The last cycle has been used in the papal bulls and other acts since Gregory VII.

In the Christian computation of time the year began in some places on the 25th December; in some others on the 1st January; in some on the 25th March (Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary); and in some at Easter. The inhabitants of Pisa began the year nine months seven days earlier than we; the Florentines, two months twenty-five days later. The calculus Florentinus was more widely spread than the caleulus Pisanus.

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23; Col. i. 15; Rom. viii. 28 sqq.

² Compare *Möhler*, *Verm. Schrift*. xi. 261 sqq.

³ *Carol. du Fresne, Dom. du Cange*, Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis. 2 vols. fol., Lugd. 1688. Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis. Par. 1678, 3 vols. fol. The work was augmented and improved op. et studio monach. scii Bened. (Par. 1733, 6 vols. fol.) by *P. Carpentier* (Par. 1766, 4 vols. fol.). The latest edition was superintended by *Henschel*. Par. 1840, 7 vols., 4. *Suiceti*, Thesaurus eccl. e patribus graecis. Amst. 1782.

⁴ *I. Mabillon*, *De re diplomatica*, xi. 6. 1 vol. fol., Par. 1709. *Bern de Montfaucon*, *Palaeographia Graeca*. Par. 1708. *Schönecker*, Attempt to form a System of Universal Dipl. Leipsic, 1808. *Wattenbach*, Introduction to Grecian Paleography. Leipsic, 1869.

⁵ *Petae*, *De doctrin. temp.* Antw. 1703. Art of verifying the Dates of Historical Events, etc., by a Benedictine monk. Par. 1750. Ed. 1783 sqq., continued up to our own days. Par. 1818 sqq. Art of, etc., from 1770-1827, by *Courcelles*. Par. 1821 sqq., 19 vols., 8. *Ideler*, Manual of Chronology. Berl. 1831. *Weidenbach*, *Calend. medii aevi*. Regensb. 1855. *Piper*, Church-Computation. Berl. 1841.

⁶ *Le Quien*, *Oriens christianus*, etc. Par. 1740, 3 vols. fol. *Ncher*, Eccl Geography and Statistics. Regensb. 1864, 2 vols. *Wiltsch*, *Atlas sacer*, etc. Gothae, 1842. Manual of Eccl. Geog. and Statistics. Berl. 1846, 2 vols.

⁷ Epigraphy, or the science of inscriptions, sphragistics, or the science of seals, and numismatics, or the science of coins, also belong to this enumeration of auxiliary sciences.

§ 2. *Literature of Ecclesiastical History.*

The first writer of Church history is Hegesippus, a converted Jew, author of "Memorable Events of the Church,"¹ of whose work only eight fragments have been preserved. The honor, however, appertaining to the title of "Father of Church History" undoubtedly belongs to Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, who, besides some apologetico-polemical works, wrote a Church history in ten volumes, extending to the year 324,² which is very valuable on account of the legal documents and original records, fragments of lost works, which it contains. This history was continued down to the time of Theodosius II. by the two administrators in Constantinople,—Socrates to the year 439, and Sozomenes to 423. Theodoret, the celebrated Bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, also wrote, in continuation of Eusebius, a valuable history of the Church, from the beginning of Arianism to the outbreak of the Nestorian disputation. His work is far superior to the two preceding continuations of bishop Eusebius. Of the Church history written by the Eunomian Philostorgius, of the years 320–423, but a few fragments remain; and these contain a glorification of heresy,—a defamation of the Church. Theodore, lector in Constantinople, made an abridgment from the works of Socrates, Sozomenes, and Theodoret, and continued the history of the first-named down to the time of the Emperor Justin I. (+527). Of this, however, but few fragments have come down to us. Evagrius, administrator in Antioch, carried on the history of the three above-named authors to the year 594, in a work of six volumes. All these authors wrote in the Greek language.³

A Latin translation and continuation of Eusebius to the year 395, by Rufinus,⁴ is disfigured by many inaccuracies and unfair criticisms. More reliable is the work of the Gallic priest, Sulpicius Severus,⁵ who has been called the Christian Sallust. This historian gives, in a pleasing style, a clear and concise view of the most important events from the creation to A. D. 400. The history of Orosius, a Spaniard,⁶ presents the main events from the deluge to the year 416. His principal object seems to have been apologetic. Cassiodorus, an eminent statesman, who afterwards became a monk, compiled his much-read *historia tripartita* from the works of Socrates, Sozomenes, and Theodoret, and continued the narration of events up to the year 518.⁷

Of no slight importance to the history of the Eastern Church are the works of the so-called Byzantines,⁸—Grecian historians who lived at Constantinople from 500 to 1500. The frequently unreliable Church history of Nicephorus Callisti in the fourteenth century⁹ comes down to the death of the Emperor Phocas (+ 610). It is a compilation in eighteen volumes.

The historians of the Middle Ages were chiefly engrossed by the events of their own time and country.

In the West, a very active movement in historical research is perceptible. Besides many valuable and interesting histories of the Church in particular countries, monographs, chronicles,¹⁰ and the like, we find several works of universal history handed down to us. Venerable Bede (+ 735), in addition to the “Chronicle of the Six Ages of the World,” wrote the history of the English Church down to the year 731. He is the father of English history, as Gregory of Tours may be styled the father of the history of the Franks. Bishop Haymo, of Halberstadt (+ 853), wrote a history of the first four centuries.¹¹ The Roman librarian Anastasius (+ 886) compiled a Latin Church history out of three Grecian chronicles.¹² Ordericus Vitalis, Abbot of St. Evreuil, in Normandy (+ 1142), drew up a Church history to the twelfth century.¹³ The history of Bartholomaeus of Lueea (+ 1327), called also Ptolemaeus de Fiadonibus, ends with the year 1312.¹⁴ St. Antonius, Archbishop of Florenee (+ 1459), who surpassed his predecessors in sagacity and critical acumen, wrote the history of the world, from the creation down to his own era.¹⁵ This is the greatest historical work of the Middle Ages.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the third period commences, a new impetus to the study of ecclesiastical history was given by the invention of the art of printing and by the study of the humanities. To these may be added the necessity of historical information indirectly arising from the controversies between Catholics and Protestants.

It was in order to confute the “Madgeburg Centuriators” that the learned Oratorian Caesar Baronius (+ 1605), Cardinal of the Roman Church, composed his Annals, which reach to the year 1198, and are remarkable for their profound erudition, as well as for bringing to light many hitherto unedited documents and original reports, together with their verified statements.¹⁶ The learned and sage Minorite (Franciscan), Anthony Pagi, completed and emended this work,¹⁷ the best continuation of which is by Oderic Raynaldus.

a member of the same Oratorian order as Baronius. It extends to 1566. These Annals of Raynaldus¹⁸ were continued by the Oratorians James of Laderchi¹⁹ and Augustine Theiner.²⁰

Among the Italian writers of Church history Cardinal J. Aug. Orsi is noted for his learning and attractive style. His work comprises the first six centuries, and was continued up to the year 1587 by a member of the same order,—the Dominican Beechetti.²¹ The Church history of the Oratorian Sacarelli,²² to the year 1185, is also very valuable. Less important is the work of the French Dominican Hyacinth de Graveson,²³ who wrote his Church history in Italy. The Augustinian, Lawrence Berti (+ 1766), wrote a good compendium and several very useful dissertations.²⁴ To our own century belong the historical compendiums of Delsignore²⁵ and Palma Anelli.²⁶

In France, historical studies were zealously pursued; though chiefly among the Dominicans, Oratorians, Jesuits, and members of the Congregation of St. Maur. Among French historical investigators the Dominican Natalis Alexander²⁷ occupies a prominent position, from his profound acquaintance with original documents and his critical acumen. His Church history derives a greater value from the learned dissertations appended to it. Roncaglia has endeavored, by his notes, to correct and neutralize the Gallican principles and views of the author. The Church history of the Abbé Claude Fleury (+ 1723), although not altogether free from Gallicanism, has many points of pre-eminent merit.²⁸ Those who have continued his history are far from equaling their master. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux (+ 1704), in his discourse on Universal History, constantly refers to the divine influence exercised in the Church. Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont (+ 1698), somewhat inclined to Jansenism, formed from the works of the Holy Fathers and early ecclesiastical writers a kind of Mosaic composition, in which he places, side by side, the most important events of the first six hundred years, principally under the form of biographies,²⁹ which, from its extraordinary intelligence and acuteness, affords a brilliant testimony to the author's great capacity. The Church histories of Fr. Timoleon de Choisi,³⁰ Berault-Bercastel,³¹ Ducreux,³² and Godeau³³ have merits of their own, but are not equal to those of the above-named authors. The compilation of Bonaventure Racine³⁴ is imbued with a Jansenistic spirit. Of modern productions we may mention the very useful history of the Abbé Rohrbacher,³⁵ the works of Henrion,³⁶ Blane Jager, Receveur, Capefique, Darras, and Wouters.³⁷

Owing to the protracted wars which followed the great schism,

the study of Church history flourished but little in Catholic Germany during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Even during the eighteenth century, when a greater impulse to this study was given, the results were insignificant. The greater number of the historians of this epoch are imbued with Febronian-Josephinistic views, which find a corresponding expression in their works; and these works themselves are for the most part superficial and insipid. Royko, Michl, Wolf, Gmeiner, and Becker belong to this class. A little better, though still unreliable, are the works of Dannemayr and Schmalfuss.

A more glorious era for Church history in Germany opened with the noble-minded convert, Frederic Leopold, Count of Stolberg.³⁸ His "History of the Religion of Jesus Christ" is based on original investigation, and is distinguished by its spirited and easy style. The continuation of this work by F. Kerz is a far inferior production; while, on the other hand, the last volumes, written by J. N. Brischar,³⁹ are much more satisfactory. The Church history of Locherer (+ 1837), up to the year 1073, is tinged with Josephinism, and is superficial; that of Reichlin Meldegg, who afterwards became a Protestant, is a slanderous libel on the Church.

A fresh impulse was given to the study of Church history by John Adam Moehler (+ 1838),⁴⁰ whose academic lectures were published by P. Pius Boniface Gams, and by him continued to the present day. Thomas Katercamp (+ 1834), professor at Munster, wrote a copious manual of Church history, permeated throughout with the ecclesiastical spirit, in a clear and elegant style. Unfortunately, he did not live to complete his work: it ends with 1153.⁴¹ Ruttenstock (+ 1844), Prelate of the Cloister of Neuburg, near Vienna,⁴² and Klein,⁴³ professor at Vienna, published useful Latin compendiums. To these may be added Professor Cherier,⁴⁴ of Tirnau. The style of Hortig,⁴⁵ Canon of the Cathedral of Munich, is eloquent and witty; but J. von Döllinger,⁴⁶ who continued Hortig's work, and entirely recast it, is vastly superior to him alike in learning as in genia. Othmar v. Rauscher,⁴⁷ Cardinal and Archbishop of Vienna (+ 1875), treats only of the first three centuries in his Church history. Manuals and compendiums of Church history were composed by Ritter⁴⁸ (+ 1857), Alzog,⁴⁹ Kraus, Vascotti, Jungmann,⁵⁰ professor at Louvain, and others. The learned professor of Tübingen, C. T. von Hefele, now Bishop of Rottenburg, wrote a history of the councils. Hergenröther, formerly professor at Würzburg, now a cardinal of the Roman Church, has written an extensive Church history in a

thoroughly Catholic spirit, exhibiting profound historical learning united with critical acumen.

The most extensive work on Church history in Protestant Germany⁵¹ is the previously mentioned ecclesiastical history of the “Madgeburg Centuriators,” at the head of whom stands Matthias Flacius Illyricus. The tendency of this being polemical, the work is naturally one-sided; many of the so-called facts are simply inventions, while others are distorted and interpolated. Yet this work served as a text-book of authority for the Protestants of Germany, and up to the eighteenth century all their writers took their cue from the “Madgeburg Centuriators.” G. Arnold, professor at Giessen, published “An Impartial History of the Church and of Heresy,” an original work, written from a pietistic standpoint, attacking alike the Catholic Church and Orthodox Lutheranism. The work of Weismann,⁵² professor at Tübingen, exhibits a milder spirit. Laurence Mosheim (+ 1755) struck out from the beaten path so long trodden by his co-religionists and returned to the study of original documents. His ecclesiastical history displays great learning, but betrays a lack of sound knowledge as to the essential nature of the Church.⁵³ John Solomon Seinler⁵⁴ (+ 1791), in Halle, was entirely too hypercritical; by his rationalistic methods of contemplation he set obstacles to true science, and rendered a sound apprehension of the character of the Church impossible. John Mathias Schröckh⁵⁵ (+ 1808), professor in Wittenberg, wrote a complete history of the Church, in a pleasing style, making judicious use of the literature connected with his subject. Unfortunately the false enlightenment of the eighteenth century cast its pernicious influence also on him. Spittler at Göttingen (+ 1810), and Henke at Helmstadt (+ 1809),⁵⁶ were even more tainted by rationalism. Christian Schmidt, professor at Giessen (+ 1831), wrote in a similar tone to Henke. A still more positive position was taken by F. Stäudlin (+ 1825), and Planck, at Göttingen.⁵⁷ His disciple, August Neander (+ 1850), was under the influence of the emotional theology of Schleiermacher.⁵⁸ He possessed considerable historical knowledge, although in speaking of the Catholic Church he betrays prejudice and the spirit of party.⁵⁹ His history comes down to Boniface VIII. The design of Danz, in Jena,⁶⁰ to form a text-book of Church history by making extracts from original documents was fully carried out by Professor John Charles Louis Gieseler⁶¹ (+ 1854), at Göttingen. The extracts, however, are not always accurate, and are often purposely abbreviated. Ferd. Christ. Bauer (+ 1860), the head of the rationalistic

school at Tübingen, attempts to account for the miraculous effects of Christianity from purely natural causes, entirely denying its divine character.⁶²

John George Engelhardt⁶³ (+ 1855), Henry Ernest Ferd. Guerike, a disciple of Neander, Charles Hase, Will. Bruno Lindner, Christian Will. Niedner⁶⁴ (+ 1865), G. A. Fricke, Henry Schmid, J. H. Kurz, F. Rud. Hasse (+ 1862), whose Church history was published by Koehler,—all wrote works more or less lengthy on Church history. Phil. Schaff,⁶⁵ working principally in the spirit of Neander, composed a history of the Ancient Church, in three volumes, comprising the first six centuries.

Among the historians of the Reformed Church, J. H. Hottinger,⁶⁶ of Zurich, became conspicuous on account of his hostility to the Catholic Church. James Basnage⁶⁷ attempted to refute Bossuet's "History of the Variations;" and his cousin, Samuel Basnage,⁶⁸ directed his work against Baronius. The polemical character was less obvious in H. Venema.⁶⁹ Shorter works were written by Fred. Spanheim (+ 1701), A. Turretin, E. Jablonsky, W. Muenscher, Fred. Schleiermacher, W. T. Matter, and others.⁷⁰

¹ Eusebius mentions some fragments. They are collected by *Routh*, *Reliquiae sacrae*, i. 189 sqq.; *Grabe*, *Spicil.* ii. 205 sqq.; *Migne*, *Patrol. graec.* v. 1303 sqq.

² Other historical works of Eusebius are the *Vita Constantini*, ll. 4, and the *Chronicon*.

³ A complete edition of their works was brought out under the supervision of the jurist *H. de Valois* (Valesius, + 1673) at the behest of the French Episcopate. *A. Potthast*, *Bibliotheca historica medii aevi*, contains a catalogue of the various editions and translations under the name of each author. Also see *Gams*, Ch. Hist.; *Möhler*, i. 28 sqq.

⁴ Hist. eccl. (*Potthast*, p. 521).

⁵ Hist. sacra (*Potthast*, p. 541).

⁶ *Historiarum*, ll. 7 (*Potthast*, p. 475). Compare *Gams*, Ch. Hist. of Spain, ii. 398 sqq.

⁷ *Potthast*, *Bibliotheca*, etc., p. 188.

⁸ *Corpus script. hist. Byzantinae*. Ed. Venet. 1727; ed. Bonn, 1828 sqq., 48 vols., 8.

⁹ He lived in Constantinople. See *Potthast*, l. c. p. 464.

¹⁰ *Potthast*, l. c. First division of the collected and miscellaneous works of the historical writers of the Middle Ages, pp. 4-95. The second division contains a catalogue of the separate works arranged alphabetically.

¹¹ *Potthast*, p. 359.

¹² Hist. eccl. seu *chronographia tripartita*. Printed in the *Corpus hist. Byzant.*

¹³ Hist. eccl. ll. 13; *Potthast*, p. 474.

¹⁴ Hist. eccl. ll. 24, ed. *Muratori*. *Script. rerum Italic.* xi. 753.

¹⁵ *Summa historialis* (*Potthast*, p. 146).

¹⁶ *Annale ecclesiastici Romae*, 1588-1609, 12 vols. fol.

¹⁷ *Critica historico-chronologica in annales Baronii.* Antwerp, 1705, 4 vols. fol.

¹⁸ *Annales ecclesiastici ab anno 1198 ubi Baron. desit.* Romae, 1646-77, 10 vols. fol. They reach to 1565. The *Annal. Baron.* Luccae, 1738-59, edited by *Mansi*, contain the criticisms of *Pagi*, and the continuation of *Raynaldus*, besides the notes of the publisher.

¹⁹ *Annales ecclesiastici ab anno 1566 ubi Raynaldus desit.* Romae, 1728-37, 3 vols. fol.

²⁰ *Annales ecclesiastici quos post Caes. Card. Baron. Oderic. Rayn., etc.* J. *Laderchum . . . ab anno 1572 ad nostra usque tempora continuat*, etc. *Theiner*, 3 vols. fol.; this same author has commenced a new edition of *Baronius*.

²¹ *Storia ecclesiastica.* Romae, 1752 sqq., 21 vols., 8. The continuation consists of 29 vols.

²² *Hist. eccl. per annos digesta, etc.* Romae, 1771 sqq., 25 vols., 4.

²³ *Hist. eccl.* Romae, 1717 sqq., 9 vols.

²⁴ *Hist. eccl. sive dissertationes historicae priorum saeculorum.* Florent. 1753. *Breviarum historiae ecclesiasticae.*

²⁵ *Institutiones hist. eccl.*, ed. *Tizzani*. Romae, 1837, 4 vols.

²⁶ *Praelectiones hist. eccl.* Romae, 1872, 4th ed., 2 vols.

²⁷ *Hist. eccl.* Paris, 1699, 8 vols. fol.; ed. Luccae, 1734, cum notis, *Const. Romagna*, 9 vols. fol.

²⁸ *Hist. eccl.* Paris, 1691 sqq., 20 vols., 4; continuée par *Fabre*, 16 vols., 4. *Heféle*, Contributions to Church History, Archaeology, and Liturgy, ii. 89 sqq.

²⁹ Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccl. des six premiers siècles. Paris, 1693, 16 vols., 4. *Heféle*, Contributions, etc., ii. 100 sqq.

³⁰ *Histoire de l'église.* Paris, 1713, 11 vols., 4.

³¹ *Histoire de l'église.* Paris, 1778, 24 vols.; continued by *Robiano* (Paris, 1836) and *Gams* (Innsbr. 1854), 3 vols.

³² *Les siècles chrétiens.* Paris, 1785, 10 vols., 12.

³³ *Histoire de l'église jusqu'à la fin du neuvième siècle.* Paris, 1663, 3 vols. fol.

³⁴ *Abrégé de l'histoire ecclésiastique.* Cologne (Paris), 1762 sqq., 13 vols., 4.

³⁵ *Histoire universelle de l'église, etc.* Paris, 1842, 29 vols. Of the German translation by *Hülsewmp* and *H. Rump*, the volumes 1-4, 6-10, and 24, have appeared.

³⁶ *Histoire ecclésiastique depuis la création jusqu'à pontificat de Pie IX.* publiée par *Migne*. Paris, 1852, 25 vols.

³⁷ *Blanc*, Cours d'histoire ecclésiastique. Paris, 1853, 2 vols. *Jager*, Cours d'histoire ecclésiastique. *Receveur*, Histoire de l'église. Paris, 1841. *Capefique*, Les quatres premiers siècles de l'église, l'église au moyen âge, l'église pendant les quatres derniers siècles. Paris, 1850 sqq. *Darras*, Histoire générale de l'église depuis le commencement de l'ère chrétienne jusqu'à nos jours. 3d ed., Paris, 1847. *Wouters*, Compendium hist. eccl. 4th ed., Nap. 1872.

³⁸ *History of the Religion of Jesus Christ.* Hamburg and Vienna, 1806-18, 15 vols.

³⁹ *Kerz* wrote vols. 16-45; *Brischar*, vols. 46-53, to Boniface VIII.

⁴⁰ Regensburg, 1867, 3 vols.

⁴¹ Munster, 1819, 5 vols., to 1153.

⁴² *Institutiones hist. eccl.* Vienna, 1832, 3 vols.

⁴³ *Hist. eccl.* Graecii, 1828, 2 vols.

⁴⁴ *Institutiones hist. eccl.* Pestini, 1848, 4 vols.

⁴⁵ Manual of Ch. Hist. Landshut, 1826, 2 vols.; the third volume is the work of *Döllinger*.

⁴⁶ Hist. of Christ. Ch. 1st and 2d divisions. Landshut, 1833. Manual of Ch. Hist., 2 vols. Neither work is as yet complete.

⁴⁷ Hist. of Christ. Ch. Sulzbach, 1829, 2 vols.

⁴⁸ Manual of Ch. Hist. 6th ed., by *Einen*. Bonn, 1862, 2 vols.

⁴⁹ Manual of Universal Ch. Hist. 9th ed. Mentz, 1872, 2 vols., translated into English, with additions by Pabisch and Byrne. Sketch of Ch. Hist. Mentz, 1868.

⁵⁰ Dissertations selectae. 6 vols. (so far).

⁵¹ Ecclesiastica historia . . . congesta per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburga. Basileae, 1559-74, 13 vols. fol. It has its name "Centuries" from the division of the matter into periods of one hundred years. *Lucas Osiander* made an epitome of it in 4 vols., Tübingae, 1592 sqq., named Epitome hist. ecel. centuriae.

⁵² Introductio in memorabilia ecclesiast. hist., etc. Hallae, 1745, 2 vols., 4.

⁵³ Institutionem hist. ecel. antiquae et recent. libri iv. Helmst. 1755. Translated into German, and continued by *John Chr. von Einen*. Leipsic, 1769 sqq., 7 vols.; also by *J. Rud. Schlegel*. Heilbronn, 1769 sqq., 6 vols.

⁵⁴ Hist. ecel. selecta capita. Hal. 1761, 3 vols. Concerning Semler and his works, see *Tholuck*, Verm. Schrift. ii. 39 sqq.

⁵⁵ Christ. Ch. Hist., 35 vols., and since the Reformation, 10 vols. Leipsic, 1768 sqq. The ninth and tenth volumes are written by *Tzschirner*, who added a biography of Schröckh. Schröckh wrote also a Latin compendium, from which the Benedictine *Gottfried Lumpcr* drew his *Institutiones hist. ecel.* *Aug. Vindcl*, 1790.

⁵⁶ Compare *Baur*, The Epochs 162 sqq., 192, 197. The 6th ed. of *Spittler*'s sketch was revised by *Planck*. The work of *Henke* was continued by *I. S. Vater*; that of *Schmidt* by *F. W. Rettburg*.

⁵⁷ *Stäudlin*, Universal History of the Christian Church, 6th ed. Hanover, 1833 (by *Aug. Holzhausen*). History and Literature of Ch. Hist., published by *J. T. Hemsen*. Hanover, 1827. *Planck*, History of the Rise and Variations of the Protestant System up to the Concordat Formula. Leipsic, 1791, 6 vols. History of the Constitution of Christian Society. Hanover, 1803 sqq., 5 vols.

⁵⁸ Hist. of Christ. Ch. Edited by *Bonnell*. Berlin, 1840.

⁵⁹ Universal History of Christian Religion and Church. 5 vols. (up to 1294). Hamburg, 1825-45. After his death a sixth volume appeared, which gives fragments of the history up to 1431.

⁶⁰ Manual of Ch. Hist. Jena, 1818, 2 vols.

⁶¹ Bonn, 1823-67, 6 vols.

⁶² The Ch. Hist. of *Baur* comprises five volumes, of which the third and fourth were published by his son, *Ferd. Friedr. Baur*, and the fifth by *Ed. Zeller*. (Tüb. 1861-1863).

⁶³ Manual of Ch. Hist., 1833, 4 vols.

⁶⁴ Manual of Ch. Hist., 2d ed. Berlin, 1866. The style is abstruse and uninviting.

⁶⁵ Church History of the first Six Centuries. Concerning some of these works, see Hist. polem. 61 vols.

⁶⁶ Hist. ecel. Hannov. and Tiguri, 1655, 9 vols. fol.

⁶⁷ Histoire de l'église. Rotterdam, 1699, 2 vols.

⁶⁸ Annales politico-ecclesiastici Rotterd. 3 vols. fol.

⁶⁹ Institutiones hist. ecel. Lugd. Batav. 1779, 5 vols., 4.

⁷⁰ Hist. des trois prem. siècles de l'église. German, from *Fabarius*. Leipsic, 1862 sqq., 4 vols.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

First Epoch.

PERIOD I.

*FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE EMPEROR
CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.*

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 3. State of Religion and Morality among the Jewish People.

IN virtue of the covenant made by God with Abraham, the great ancestor of this race,—a covenant which was afterwards renewed and confirmed with Isaac and Jacob,—the Israelites were the bearers of the high commission, to preserve among the nations of the earth the knowledge of the one, true, and only God, by keeping the faith in him untainted by idolatry, by observing his commandments, and by the offering up of sacrifices. In this way they were to prepare the whole human race for the coming of the Messias.

It is unfortunately true that these Israelites were not always faithful in acting up to this their high vocation, on which moreover the very existence of their independence as a nation was founded. Yet, when chastised by Divine Providence, as at the time of the Judges, or more severely as at the time of the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, they listened to the warnings and admonitions of their prophets and penitently returned to the God of their fathers, they then became again by their teaching, by their social, political, and religious institutions, and above all by their exemplary mode of worship, a brilliant star, shining luminously amid the darkness of

the shadow of death, cast over the world by Paganism; a bright light in the deep religious gloom of moral dissolution, in which mankind at large were enveloped.

Yet at no time did the Israelites seem to be more conscious of their high vocation; never were they better prepared for the reception of the Messias than immediately before the coming of Jesus Christ. They then avoided with scrupulous anxiety all intercourse with the heathen, held fast to the faith of their fathers,¹ were even punctilious in fulfilling exactly all the requirements of the law, and cherished an eager, longing desire for the coming of Jesus Christ, which they held to be near at hand. But when he came unto his own “his own received him not” (John i. 1); and their aversion to him rose step by step until it reached the point of mortal hatred,—a fact which finds its principal, perhaps its only real solution, in the supposition, that this strict observance of their religious rites at this time by the Jews had its foundation more especially in the political condition of the period; that their fulfilment of the requirements of the law was too frequently only an exterior, a literal observance which did not prevent gross corruption of the heart (Matt. xv. 8: *Populus hic labiis me honorat; cor autem eorum longe est a me*),² and which instead of true piety engendered a proud self-righteousness. To this may be added the fact that most of them looked for an earthly Redeemer in the Messias (see and compare § 9). In this way it happened that while a few attached themselves to the Savior, the great majority, whose expectations of and longing for the Messias proceeded mainly from national and earthly motives, turned away with abhorrence from One who came to free them from the yoke of sin and not from that of the Romans (Gal. iii. 13).

The interior disturbances among the Jews of that period is sufficiently clear in considering the different sectaries. The Sadducees, who belonged to the higher class and kept the people at a distance, were rationalists in their doctrine, epicurean in their mode of life (Matt. xxii. 23).³ The Pharisees, on the other hand, the friends and

¹ *Flavius Josephus*, *Antiq. Judaic.* xviii. 8, 1 sqq.; *De bello Jud.* ii. 10, 1. *Tacitus*, *Hist.* v. 5. *Sub Tiberio quies; dein, jussi a C. Caesare effigiem ejus in templo locare, arma potius sumpsere, quem motum Caesaris mors diremit.*

² On the decline of morals, see § 9. The controversy of the schools of Hillel and Schammai on divorce (Deut. xxiv. 1), gives an instructive insight as to the moral aberrations of the Jews.

³ *Acts* xxiii. 8. *Josephus*, *Ant. xviii.* 1-4; *De bello Jud.* ii. 8, 14.

teachers of the people, were believing Jews; yet, with few exceptions, they contented themselves with an outward and minute observance of the law, while neglecting the most important duties, and even committing great social immoralities (Matt. xv. 1 sqq.; xxiii. 1 sq.; Mark vii. 3 sq.; Luke xi. 37 sq.).¹

Fewer in number was the sect of the Essenes,² who disfigured Judaism by introducing ethnical dogmas and the religious rites of foreign nations; besides which they rejected the sacrifice, and in the observance of trivial ceremonies went beyond the Pharisees themselves. They dwelt by the Dead Sea, held their goods in common, and were divided into four grades. By the Jews they were for the most part shunned, although they yearly sent offerings to the Temple. Related to the Essenes, but not a branch of them, were the Therapeutæ³ in Egypt, who united the contemplative with the active life.

The Galileans and Herodians⁴ were merely political parties: the first were zealots for political independence; the latter were friends and adherents of the government, i. e. of Herod, the nominee of the Roman power.

Those Jews who were dispersed throughout foreign countries⁵—*οἱ ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*—kept up an intimate intercourse with those of Palestine, by paying the annual tribute to the Temple,—*διδραχμα*,—and by making frequent pilgrimages to Jerusalem. They spoke Greek (Septuagint), and, in spite of their genuine attachment to the religion of their fathers, yielded more to the heathenish influences to which they were exposed than did their fellow-believers in Palestine. The Alexandrian philosophy of religion as developed by Aristobolus and Philo⁶ had its origin in a latent amalgamation of Platonic ideas with the doctrines of the Old Testament.

Lastly, we have to mention the Samaritans,⁷ a mixed race, which sprang from the intermarriages between the Assyrian colonists of

¹ *Jos.* Ant. xviii. 1, 3; cf. xvii. 2, 4.

² *Jos.* De bello Jud. ii. 8, 2 sqq.; Ant. xviii. 1, 5.

³ *Philo*, De vita contemplativa, ed. Richter. Lips. 1828, v. 304 sqq. *Eus.* H. E. ii. 17.

⁴ Luke xiii. 4. Mark iii. 4-6.

⁵ *Jos.* Ant. xii. 3, 1 sqq.; De bello Jud. vii. 3, 3. For the Jews in the Diaspora the Pentateuch was translated under Ptolomæus Philadelphus (it is said by the seventy-two interpreters, LXX, *οἱ ὥ*), and soon after the other books were one by one translated into Greek.

⁶ *Philonis* (+ 41 A. D.), Opera ed. *Mangey*. Lond. 1742, 2 vols. fol.

⁷ Compare 4 Reg. xvii. 24 sqq. *Jos.* Ant. xi. 7, 2; viii. 2 sqq.

Palestine with those of the Jews, who had been permitted by Salmanassar to remain when he put an end to the kingdom of Israel as a nation and carried the majority of its people into captivity. They were monotheists, who accepted the Pentateuch alone as a rule of life. They offered sacrifice to God on Mount Garizim, and imitated the Jewish Liturgy. In reference to religion, however, they stood far below the Jews, who despised them and avoided them as unclean (Luke ix. 52 sqq. ; John iv. 9, 22).

§ 4. *Lights and Shadows of Heathenism.*

Through Judaism mankind received a positive and direct preparation for the recognition of the coming Redeemer ; in a negative and indirect manner the same preparation might be said to have taken place through that paganism which had completed its development both interiorly and exteriorly in the world-wide Roman Empire.

In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle of the Gentiles depicts in very graphic terms (Rom. i. 18 sqq.) the origin, nature, and effect of paganism, which ranges through every grade of nature and animal worship from fetichism to the personified gods of the Greeks and Romans, and is a practical denial of the unity, spirituality, and sanctity of God, of Divine Providence, and of the universality of religion, the place of which was usurped by a materialistic and immoral polytheism, by fate, and a national worship. As worship such as this could neither satisfy the intellect nor offer sufficient motives to induce mankind to pursue a right course of action,¹ it led of necessity to a great decline in intellectuality and in morality.

The pernicious results of idolatry in both these respects became prominently conspicuous during the period when the Roman emperors dominated the world. With the increase of wealth and exterior prosperity, social corruption kept more than equal pace. Unbelief and superstition prevailed more and more² among all

¹ *Lact.* Institut. iv. 3. Deorum cultus non habet sapientiam, quia nihil ibi discitur, quod proficiat *ad mores excelendos* vitamque formandum ; nec habet *inquisitionem aliquam veritatis*, sed tantum modo ritum colendi, qui ministerio corporis constat.

² The apotheosis or deification of the vicious and immoral emperors did a great deal towards the destruction of all religious sentiment ; superstition showed itself in auguries and soothsaying, in fortune-telling and interpretation of dreams.

classes; the contented simplicity and frugality of early times vanished before the avarice and extravagance of the empire. Egotism led to the disregard of the dignity of human nature as such. This was shown in the unnatural treatment of slaves, in the gladiatorial shows, and in the gross violation of the law of nations. The dominion of unbridled passion resulted at length in the corruption of the conjugal tie,¹ in a fearful immorality, and in the most horrible impurity practised in worship of these false gods.

This outgrowth of heathenism could not be checked by philosophy, still less by the mysteries; for, although men like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and others cherished purer notions concerning the existence of God, and the relation he bore to the world, these ideas could not regenerate the people at large, because not only this glance of light was dimmed and obscured by a thick haze of spiritual and moral error, but the philosophic schools were not accessible to the mass of the people, while their representatives kept up exteriorly an accommodating intercourse with the national religion and its soul-destroying worship.²

Perhaps at no time was philosophy so little efficient in ennobling the human race as during the time of the empire: nay, its influence tended rather to vitiate it; for the scepticism of the Academicians undermined all religion whatsoever, while the reawakened Pythagoreanism and Neoplatonism placed themselves at the service of superstition. On the other hand, the Stoics and Peripatetics exercised but slight influence on their contemporaries.

Notwithstanding this, the heathens, whom God allowed to pursue their own course, to make them feelingly alive to the want and necessity of redemption, were not altogether without connecting links to bind them to Christianity. Three truths had been preserved among the heathens which proved of the highest importance:

1. There was a consciousness of God.³
2. The consciousness of guilt,⁴

¹ *Horatius*, lib. iii. carm. vi.

² Cf. *Cicero*, *De divin.* ii. 58. *Nescio quomodo, nihil tam absurde dici potest quod non dicatur ab aliquo Philosophorum.* *Quaest. Tuscul.* ii. 1. *Est philosophia paucis contenta judicibus, multitudinem consulto ipsa fugiens, eique ipsi et suspecta et invisa, etc.*

³ *Tertullian*, *Apol.* c. 17. *Haec est summa delicti nolentium recognoscere quem ignorare non possunt, etc.* Cf. *Tert.* *De testim. animae.* *Minuc. Felix, Octavini*, c. 18.

⁴ *Ovid*, *Fast.* vi. 161, 162. *Cor pro corde, precor, pro fibris sumite fibras. Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus.*

emphatically expressed in the bloody sacrifices of an expiatory character. 3. There was the hope of a Redeemer to come.¹

This threefold consciousness, which may be termed three divine sparks retained of a primitive revelation, was kept alive in a special manner by the constant intercourse of the pagans with the Jews, who had settled themselves in almost all the large cities of the Roman Empire, and whose doctrine and worship² had made a profound impression on the heathen among whom they dwelt, of whom not a few, especially among the women, were induced to unite themselves to Judaism, either as Proselytes of the Gate or as Proselytes of Justice.

Lastly, it happened that the exterior conditions of the world were so ordered by Divine Providence as to render the rapid spread of the kingdom of the Redeemer feasible; for the various nations of the earth who had hitherto lived in constant hostility to one another were now united under the world-wide sceptre of Roman rule.³ The Greek language had been accepted almost everywhere, and the whole world was rejoicing in a universal peace under Augustus Cæsar.

Then appeared the Prince of Peace, whose coming all the nations of the earth were awaiting.

§ 5. *Jesus Christ.—The God-Man.—Foundation of the Church.*

When the “fulness of time” had come (Gal. iv. 4), the Eternal Father sent into the world his only-begotten consubstantial Son, who assumed human nature from the Virgin Mary, and was born in Bethlehem, as the prophets of the Old Testament had foretold (Isa. vii. 14; Mich. ii. 5; Matt. i. 1 sqq.).⁴

Apart from the flight into Egypt⁵ and a transitory sojourn at Jerusalem (Luke ii. 42 sqq.), Jesus Christ, at whose crib the representatives of Judaism and of heathenism had both bowed down in

¹ *Virgil*, Eclog. iv. 4. Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis aetas; Magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo. Jam reddit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna; Jam nova progenies coelo demittitur alto, etc. Cf. *Tacit. Historia*, v. 13. Pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis Sacerdotum litteris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judea rerum potirentur. *Sueton. Vita Vesp.* c. 4.

² See *Aug. Civ. Dei*, vi. 11.

³ *Orig. c. Celsum*, ii. 30. *Eus. Demonstratio Evangelica*, iii. 6.

⁴ The year of Christ's nativity according to Dionysius Exiguus (Denys the Little) is 754, P. R. C.; according to others, 752 (Riess, S. J.), 751, 749, or 747.

⁵ Christ's sojourn in Egypt lasted until the death of Herod the Great (Matt. ii. 13-19 sqq.); therefore, at most, only from three to four years.

adoration (Luke ii. 10 sqq.; Matt. ii. 1 sqq.), passed his life up to his thirtieth year in seclusion at Nazareth (Luke ii. 51); after which, having been announced by John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 11 sqq.; Mark i. 1 sqq.; Luke iii. 1 sqq.) as the promised Messias (John i. 7 and 29), he entered on the duties of his public mission, the scene of which was laid throughout the whole country of the Jews, and which lasted three years.

Throughout his journeyings in Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa, Jesus, who had acquired his all-surpassing wisdom neither from the sages of Egypt nor from the Essenes, nor yet in the Rabbinical schools,¹ proved himself not only the absolute sinless ideal of manhood, the son of man, but also the true Son of God (2 Cor. v. 19), by the purity of his life and doctrine.

The divinity of the Savior, who on the most solemn occasions proclaimed himself to be the Son of God in the proper sense of the word, which demands divine honor to be paid to him, is prominently brought under our notice by his doctrine, which bears the stamp of the divine impress; by his power over nature, which was principally shown in the miracles he performed; by his surpassing wisdom, which enabled him to read the innermost thoughts of man and to foretell future events; and, finally, by his absolute perfection and sanctity.

As to the object of his appearance on earth, Jesus Christ himself announces it to be the redemption of mankind (Matt. xvi. 21, xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10) and the foundation of the kingdom of the new and eternal covenant, *Regnum coelorum* (Matt. viii. 11, xi. 12; Luke iv. 43, xvi. 16), which should break through the limits of the land of Judæa, embrace every nation upon earth, and last to the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). *Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, etc.* (Mark xvi. 15).

In order to found and to extend this kingdom, Christ, the Supreme Teacher, King, and High-priest, chose the **TWELVE APOSTLES**, whom he sent out endowed with the specific powers and intrusted with the same commission which he himself had received from the Father. More especially did he delegate to them the full power to preach his doctrine with divine authority, to administer the sacraments to

¹ All hypotheses of this character are contradicted by the simple words of the dwellers of Nazareth: *Unde huic (scil. Jesu) haec omnia? et quae est sapientia, quae data est illi et virtutes tales, quae per manus ejus efficiuntur? Nonne hic est faber, filius Mariae, frater Jacobi et Joseph et Judae et Simonis?* (Mark vi. 3.)

the people, and to rule the Church (John xv. 16; Matt. xxviii. 19, x. 40; xviii. 18; Luke xvi. 16). Among these apostles, Jesus Christ bestowed on St. Peter a peculiarly special dignity and power. He selected him as the fundamental rock, that is, to be the centre of unity in his Church; to him he delivered the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with the sublime power of binding and loosing; he appointed him supreme ruler over the entire Church,—the shepherd, in fact, of the whole flock (Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xxii. 31, 32; John xxi. 15 sqq.).

It was in this manner that according to the ordinance of Christ, who came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil, the Church was to supersede the Synagogue, and the seat of Moses¹ was to become the seat of Peter.²

This “coming of Jesus,” who went about the whole land of Judæa “doing good and healing such as were possessed” (Acts x. 38), created a great sensation among the people. One part of them, particularly in Galilee, acknowledged him as the Messias; on the other hand, the Pharisees and elders of the people—that is, the highpriests—declared him to be a blasphemer (John vii. 45 sqq., ix. 22). Their aversion to him was increased by the resurrection of Lazarus, which worked up their hatred to the point of outbreak. At the instance of Caiphas, the Sanhedrim was incited to the resolve of delivering Jesus to death (John xi. 47 sqq.; Matt. xxvi. 4; Mark xiv. 2; Luke xix. 29 sqq.); after which they cautiously awaited a favorable opportunity for accomplishing this design. And when at length his hour was come, Jesus, who had made known to the apostles the secret designs of his enemies, celebrated, shortly before the feast of the Passover, his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, that he might deliver himself up into the hands of sinners. A short time previously he had shown himself, transfigured in glory upon Mount Thabor, to his favorite disciples. Saluted now by the people as the Messias, Jesus taught and healed in the Temple, solemnized on the day before the Easter festival the feast of the Passover with his disciples, and in the place of the paschal lamb substituted the unbloody sacrifice of the new covenant, as a continual remembrance of the bloody sacrifice which he was about to offer on the day following for the salvation of the world. He then betook himself to the

¹ *Macar.* Hom. 26, 23 : Πέτρος Μωσέα διεδέξατο, τὴν καυνὴν ἐκκλησίαν Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀληθινήν ιερωσύνην ἐγχειρισθεῖς.

² *Garucci*, Vetri ornati di figure in oro trovati nei cimiteri di Roma. Rom. 1864, 2d ed. *Kraus*, Roma sotterranea, p. 289, sqq.

Mount of Olives (Matt. xxvi. 1 sqq.; Mark xiv. 1 sqq.; Luke xix. 29 sqq.).

Headed by Judas the betrayer, a troop of constables and soldiers of the high-priests presently made their appearance. These were first made to feel the power of the Savior, after which he permitted himself, of his own free will, to be shackled and taken prisoner, thence to be dragged before the Council. Here Jesus, being adjudged by Caiphas, the high-priest, testified once again in the plainest and most solemn manner to his being the Messias and to his own divine nature; upon which the Sanhedrim adjudged him to death as a blasphemer (Matt. xxvi. 63).

But in order on the one hand to insure the execution of this their sentence of death, and on the other to subject the object of their hate to the most shameful kind of death, the enemies of Jesus dragged him before the Roman Procurator, Pontius Pilate, where, they accused him of rebellion and high-treason against Cæsar (Luke xxiii. 2 sqq.). Pilate, however, was soon convinced of the groundlessness of these charges. Even Herod, before whom he was subsequently brought, found no fault in him (Luke xxiii. 7 sqq.; John xix. 12 sqq.); on which account the high-priests resumed their former accusation of blasphemy before Pilate, when Jesus again affirmed that he was the Son of God (John xix. 7 sqq.; cf. xviii. 36 sqq.; Matt. xxvii. 19, 24; 1 Tim. vi. 12). Then at length, from cowardice, the Procurator weakly yielded to the clamors of the scribes and of the misled populace, and actually sentenced the Savior — to whom the Jews had preferred Barabbas — to the most shameful death on the cross. But it was precisely by his very death on Golgotha that Jesus destroyed the dominion of death and of Satan, and completed the work of redemption, the seal of which was placed on it by the greatest of all miracles, that of the glorious resurrection which followed, as the Savior had prophesied (Matt. xii. 38 sqq.; 1 Cor. xv. 14 sqq.; John x. 17, 18). After his resurrection Jesus repeatedly appeared to his apostles and disciples (Matt. xxviii. 9 sqq.; Mark xvi. 9 sqq.; Luke xxiv. 13 sqq.; John xx. 14 sqq.), and gave special instructions and precepts respecting the Church. Then from the Mount of Olives, on which those apostles and friends had assembled around him, having once more imparted his blessing, he ascended into heaven before their eyes, whence he had promised to send down upon them the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the Spirit of all Truth.

This is a short sketch of the history of Jesus Christ according to

the simple and authentic account of the Evangelists. Throughout the whole he appears as God and man in one person,—the God-man.

Of “a perfect Jewish Rabbi,” such as the deistic Rationalism of the last century wished to see in the Messias, there is not the faintest trace. Just as little is there to justify the myth-hypothesis of a Strauss.

The appearance of the Son of God in the flesh and the institution of a Church to teach all nations is and remains the main object in the whole of the world’s history, and all the events of that history refer themselves in their ultimate object to Jesus Christ,¹ who declares himself to be the Alpha and Omega, the principle and term of every creature (1 Cor. iii. 22, 23; Apoc. i. 8).

1. Besides Holy Writ, there are other works that contain information concerning Christ. These are principally:—

1. A Syrian letter written in the year 73 by Mara to his son Serapion (edited by Cureton (+ 1864), in his *Spicilegium Syriaeum*. London, 1855).

2. The correspondence between Christ and Abgar, King of Edessa, the authenticity of which has been contested, but which was defended by *Welte* in *Tüb. Quarterly*, 1842, by *Rinck*, and others. It was given by *Eusebius* (H. E. i. 13), translated into Greek, and lately in the original Syriac by *Cureton*, in his *Ancient Syriac Documents*, etc.

3. The greatly contested testimony of Flavius Josephus: Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦν, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἰγεὶς ἀνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ· ἦν γάρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τὸν ἥδοντά τάληθῆ δεχομένων. Καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἐλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγητο. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδεῖται τὸν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν, σταυρῷ ἐπιτειμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ γε πρῶτοι αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. Ἐφάνη γάρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ἥῶν, τὸν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτα τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Εἰς ἔτι νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον. Aut. xviii. 3, 3. “There was at this time Jesus, a wise man, if, indeed, he may be properly called a man, for he was a doer of amazing works, a teacher of truth to those willing to receive it; he was followed by many of the Jews and Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the instigation of our leading men, had condemned him to the death of the cross, those who had loved him from the beginning did not cease so to do. For he appeared to them alive on the third day: the holy prophets having foretold this and much more concerning him; and to this day the Christians who are named after him have not disappeared.” On the genuineness of this passage, which was first quoted by *Eusebius* (H. E. i. 1, 11, Dem. evang. iii. 5), see *Schoedel*, *Flav. Jos. de Jes. Chr. testatus*. Lips. 1840.

4. A mixture of truth and falsehood is found in the Apocryphal Gospels (*Thilo*, Cod. apoer. nov. test. Lips. 1832. *Tischendorf*, Cod. apoer. Lips. 1853).

Undoubtedly spurious are the pretended reports of Pilate to the Emperor Tiberius (*Thilo*, p. 803 sqq.), and of Lentulus to the Roman senate on Christ. *Fabric.* Cod. apoer. i. 301.

5. The various reports concerning Christ are collected from the works of the Fathers in *Grabe*, *Spiel. ss. patr. ut et haeret.* Oxon. 1700.

§ 6. *Pentecost.—Admission of Jews and Gentiles into the Church.*

Ten days after the ascension of Christ, the apostles, whose number had been completed by the election of Matthias, were all assembled in one place at Jerusalem with the mother of Jesus, when the Holy Ghost descended upon them; and thus miraculously enlightened and endowed with the gift of all languages (Acts ii. 4 sqq.), the apostles began their mission of preaching the gospel. Such an impression was made on the dwellers in the city, and the numerous strangers present, that even on the first day three thousand men applied for baptism (Acts ii. 41). These were the first-fruits of the Church called into publicity by the preaching of the apostles.

The newly converted, who soon numbered five thousand, were not at first utterly divided from the Synagogue. They took part in the prayers and sacrifices of the Temple; but meantime they assembled at appointed places, in order to listen to the preaching of the apostles, to solemnize the mysteries, and to pray (Acts ii. 42). In the first fervor of their zeal, they established a kind of community of goods (Acts ii. 44).

The complaint of the Hellenists against the Hebrews, that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration¹ (Acts vi. 1-7, viii. 5 sqq.), was the cause of seven deacons being appointed by the apostles to regulate the distribution; these men were ordained to this office by the laying on of hands and by prayer. Their duties consisted in the distribution of alms and in providing for the tables; they also assisted in preaching and in the administration of baptism.

At first the Sanhedrim took no notice of these proceedings in Jerusalem, but it could not long continue to ignore the great sensation created by the preaching and miracles of the apostles. The combat between the Synagogue and the Church began. On the occasion of the healing of one lame from his birth by the apostles Peter and John, these latter were arrested at the instigation of the Sadducees, and dismissed with a prohibition not again to preach in the name of Christ. As this did not avail to prevent them, the two apostles were again imprisoned and scourged, and only saved from worse treatment by the arguments of the sagacious Gamaliel. As in spite of this the number of the faithful increased every day, and some even of

¹ The Hellenists were those Jews who spoke Greek, in contradistinction to those Hebrews (i. e. Jews) who resided in Palestine and spoke their own language.

the Jewish priests embraced the faith, the leading members of the Sanhedrim tried to effect by violence what threats had failed to accomplish. A persecution was stirred up against the whole body of Christians, the first victim of which was St. Stephen, who thus became the protomartyr of the Church (Aets iv. 7 sqq., v. 12 sqq., vi. 9 sqq., vii. 1 sqq.). But even this action did not effect its object: on the contrary, persecution was rather the cause of spreading Christianity further, since many Christians left Jerusalem on that account, and went to announce the gospel in Samaria and other places (Aets viii. 4, xi. 19); as, for example, in Syria, Phenicia, and the Isle of Cyprus.

Peter and John went to Samaria to administer the sacrament of confirmation to those who had been converted and baptized by Philip the Deacon.

The apostles could entertain no doubt as to the call of the Gentiles into the Church; but the time and conditions under which they were to be admitted were as yet unknown to them. The difficulties which stood in the way were removed by a divine revelation vouchsafed to St. Peter, who, in accordance with its behest, received the Centurion Cornelius into the Church without obliging him first to become a proselyte of justice¹ (Acts x. 1). Some short time after this a large community of Christians arose in Antioch, formed chiefly from Gentile converts; these stood in intimate relation with the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem (Acts xi. 26).

Meantime a new enemy to the Church appeared in the capital city of Judæa. Herod Agrippa, newly reinstated by Claudius, being king, oppressed the Christians, and to please the Jews had James, the brother of St. John, put to death, and imprisoned Peter; but Peter was delivered from the jail in a miraculous manner by an angel, and betook himself to another place (Acts xii. 17; see § 8).²

§ 7. *Conversion and Apostolic Labors of St. Paul.*

Saul, afterwards called Paul³ (Acts xiii. 9), was a native of Tarsus, and a disciple of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3), in Jerusalem. At

¹ It was precisely through the laws of *food* that the separation was made between the Jews and foreigners; the Jews would have been rendered unclean by partaking of unclean animals. Cf. *Eus. Praeparatio evang.* viii. 9.

² Agrippa I. was a son of Aristobulus, and the grandson of Herod the Great.

³ According to *St. Jerome*, *Comm. in ep. ad Philem.* u. *catal. script. eccl.* c. 5,

first he was a fierce enemy of the Christians (Acts vii. 59, viii. 3, ix. 11 sqq.), but was suddenly changed by an apparition of the Savior to him when he was on the way to Damascus for the purpose of persecuting the faithful in that place; thereupon he was received into the Church by Ananias, about the year 34 or 35.

Being now fired with zeal for Christ, Paul began to announce him as the Redeemer in the synagogues of Damascus; but the Jews combined against him; they even attempted his life (Acts ix. 4 sqq.; 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33), on which account he withdrew to Arabia (Gal. i. 17). It was three years after his conversion that he left his retirement, and after a short sojourn in Damascus (Gal. i. 17) came to Jerusalem "to see Peter." Here, being persecuted by the Hellenists, he tarried a while at Tarsus; he then assisted Barnabas in Antioch (Acts xi. 25-30), and returned a second time to Jerusalem in his company, as the bearer of alms from Antioch to the common fund (Acts xi. 30). Returning to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas were both consecrated bishops, and immediately departed on their missionary travels.

Their first missionary journey lasted about from 45 to 48. The two apostles, accompanied by Mark, whom, however, they left at Perge, travelled from Antioch, traversed the island of Cyprus, which was governed by Sergius Paulus, who became a Christian, then visited Pamphylia, Pisidia in the province of Antiochia, and in Lyconia, the cities of Iconium, Lystra, Derbe. Everywhere they preached the gospel, first to the Jews, afterwards with more success to the Gentiles. They founded Christian communities, for which they ordained pastors by prayer, fasting, and laying on of hands (Acts xiv. 23); after which they returned to Antioch in Syria, whence they had been absent for about three years (Acts xiii. 4, xiv. 25).

During the residence of the apostles in this last-named city, some Jewish converts from Jerusalem caused some trouble by insisting that the ceremonial of the Mosaic law was binding on the Gentile converts. This induced Paul to take a third journey to Jerusalem, in order to lay the contested question before the other apostles for their decision. This first apostolical council, at which were present Peter, James, John, Paul, and Barnabas, besides the

the apostle took this name in commemoration of the conversion of the Proconsul of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus; but possibly it is only his Hebrew name, changed into the corresponding Greek one. This often occurs in Holy Writ; as, for example, Dositheus instead of Dosthai, Jason instead of Jesus.

priests of the city, was held in Jerusalem (50-51). It was then and there decreed, in the name of the Holy Ghost, that no heavier burdens should be laid upon the Gentiles than that they should abstain from things sacrificed to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication (Acts xv. 1 sqq.; Gal. ii. 1 sqq.).

The Jewish Christians in Palestine, who were not immediately affected by this decision, continued to observe the ritual law which was so intimately interwoven with the law of their country; but it was otherwise with the community outside of Palestine. Peter when in Antioch did not hesitate to eat with the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 11). Yet he, together with Barnabas and the other Jewish Christians of the place, separated himself afterwards from the table of the Gentile Christians, in order not to scandalize some fellow-Christians newly arrived from Jerusalem. St. Paul openly blamed this conduct of the prince of the apostles, as he saw danger likely to result to the Church by this means.¹

The fact, however, that even the Jewish Christians were no longer bound by the Mosaic law was equally well known to and agreed upon by both the apostles (Acts xv. 7 sqq., xvi. 3, xxi. 23-26).

It was no great while after the council at Jerusalem that, Barnabas and Mark having embarked for Cyprus, Paul, accompanied by Silas, set out on his second missionary journey about the years 52-55. In Lystra he was joined by Timothy, in Troas by Luke. After visiting the communities previously established, the apostle tarried a while in Phrygia and Galatia; then, incited thereto by a vision in his sleep, he went over to Macedonia, where he founded the congregations of Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa: from which last-named city St. Paul, taking leave of his companions, went over to Athens and preached to the inhabitants the "One unknown God." Among others he received Dionysius the Areopagite into the Church. From Athens he went to Corinth, where his co-laborers again joined him (1 and 2 Thess.). Notwithstanding the hostilities of the Jews, they were successful in establishing the Church of Corinth. In this luxurious and effeminate city and its suburbs St. Paul and his companions remained eighteen months, and aided by Aquila and Priscilla, in whose house St. Paul abode, they reaped a rich harvest. It was here he wrote the first and

¹ That such dangers were imminent is shown by the epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, as also by the sects springing up among the Jews. The relation which the law bears to the gospel is laid down in express terms in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians.

second epistles to the Thessalonians. From Corinth the apostle visited Ephesus, and made his fourth journey through Cæsarea and Jerusalem back again to Antioch.

After a short stay in this city, Paul set out on his third mission about the year 57 or 58. He travelled through Galatia and Phrygia, and came to Ephesus, in which place he worked with much effect for two years and three months. Here he wrote his epistle to the Galatians and his first epistle to the Corinthians. A sedition excited by Demetrius, a silversmith, who made idols in silver for the Temple, obliged him to leave the city. He travelled through Macedonia, whence dates his second epistle to the Corinthians, and then came to Greece, and remained three months at Corinth, whence he wrote to the Romans. After three months he returned through Miletus, Ptolemais, and Cæsarea, to Jerusalem for the fifth time.

By the advice of St. James, Paul soon after his arrival in Jerusalem paid a visit to the Temple (Acts xxi. 24 sqq., xxii. 1 sqq.); but soon he found himself in danger of his life, from which he was rescued by the tribune in charge of the peace of the city. On the following day Paul, who had pleaded his rights as a Roman citizen, to exempt him from a threatened scourging, was brought before the Sanhedrim, the members of which, being divided among themselves, could not convict him of any crime (Acts xxiii. 9 sqq.). Nevertheless, as a conspiracy had been formed against his life, the commander, Claudius Lysias, had him taken to Cæsarea under a military escort, and there brought before Felix, the governor. Here he remained in custody for two years, and then, having appealed to Cæsar, was sent by Portius Festus, the successor of Felix, to Rome, to have his case tried there (Acts xxv. 16, 18). After a stormy voyage he reached Rome in the spring of 61 or 62; and there for two years was retained in a sort of easy captivity, during which time he preached the gospel both to Jews and Gentiles.¹ At latest, it was in the beginning of the year 64 when Paul was again set at liberty.²

After regaining his freedom, Paul went to the farthest limits of the West,³ i. e. to Spain, according to the most ancient authorities, to which place he had already intended to go before his arrest (Rom. xv. 24, 28). From this far-off land he went back to Asia Minor, to

¹ Acts xxviii. 17-31. Cf. Digest, xlvi. 3, 1; 22, 9 (from Ulpian, *De off. proconsul.* i. 2 and 10). In the first Roman captivity Paul wrote his epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon. ² Epistle to the Hebrews.

³ See Clement of Rome in his first letter to the Corinthians. The so-called Muratorian Canon mentions the fact expressly.

Ephesus, and to Macedonia;¹ perhaps tarried a while in the island of Crete, where he left Titus as bishop of the place, and came later from Ephesus to Corinth and Nicopolis.

Dionysius of Corinth affirms that Paul met Peter at Corinth, and returned with him to Rome, where he was again sent to prison. Here he wrote his second epistle to Timothy. On the 29th June, A. D. 68, he attained the martyr's crown. During the whole of his missionary life² the apostle of the Gentiles had brightly manifested his great love for Christ and his ardent zeal for the salvation of mankind,³ thus realizing what he had said of himself (1 Cor. ix. 22), "I became all things to all men that I might save all."

§ 8. *Apostolic Labors of St. Peter and of the other Apostles.*

St. Peter⁴ began to exercise the office of primate, intrusted to him by Christ, soon after the ascension of the Savior (Acts i. 15, ii. 14, iii. 1, 11, iv. 8, v. 3, 8, 29). After a short sojourn in Samaria he visited the other Christian communities, then newly established (Acts viii. 4 sqq., ix. 32), and subsequently undertook the direction of the Jewish Christian congregation founded by himself in Antioch. He also preached the Christian faith in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and so on (1 Pet. i. 1). Under the reign of Claudius Peter came to Rome, and here he overcame Simon Magus⁵ and founded the Roman Church, which he henceforth presided over as bishop.

The actual presence of Peter in Rome, and the consequent foundation⁶ by him of the Roman Church, is attested by the whole of

¹ First letter to Timothy, whom Paul had consecrated Bishop of Ephesus.

² Acts xiv. 7-11; 2 Cor. iv. 10, x. 10.

³ Rom. i. 14 sqq.; 1 Thess. i. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 40; 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 9.

⁴ *Cuccagni*, Vita di San Pietro. Rom. 1777 sqq., 3 vols.

⁵ *Hippol.* Philos. vi. 20. According to *Eusebius* (H. E. xi. 14) this scene took place in the time when Claudius reigned. The presence of Simon Magus in Rome is proved by *Just.* (Apol. i. 26, 56), who demands that the statue erected to the magician on the island in the Tiber should be thrown down. See also *Just.* Dial. cum Tryph. c. 120; *Iren.* Adv. haer. i. 20, 1; *Tert.* Apol. c. 13; and the *Philosophumena*. Cf. *Prud.* Maran. praef. ad op. Inst. iii. 6.

⁶ That St. Peter founded the Church in Rome is presupposed by *Clcm.* Rom.; *Ignat.* Ant. Ep. ad Rom. c. 4; *Cyp.* Ep. 52, 55, 56. St. Peter is expressly designated as founder of the Roman Church by *Dionys.* Cor. ap. *Eus.* H. E. xi. 25; *Iren.* iii. 1, 1, ap. *Eus.* H. E. v. 8; iii. 3, 3, ap. *Eus.* v. 6; iii. 3, 2, where he speaks of "a glorioissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundata et constituta ecclesia." If in these places Peter and Paul are named as the founders, it is correct in so far as the latter by his apostolic labors and his martyrdom became in some

Christian antiquity; also that this foundation took place in the time of Claudius is directly or indirectly established by testimony handed down to us.¹

Whether, however, this arrival of the apostle in the Eternal City took place before or after his imprisonment in Jerusalem is not so certain; the latter view seems to be the more probable one.

The edict of Claudius² against the Jews expelled Peter from Rome. He then betook himself again to Jerusalem, where he presided at the Apostolical Council;³ then he stayed a while in Antioch,⁴ and was active in other places, as, for example, in Corinth.

When Nero assumed the imperial purple,⁵ the prince of the degree a second founder of this Church; but that St. Paul was not the original founder is evident from his letter to the Romans (i. 18; xv. 20-25). Therefore St. Peter alone can be the real founder of this Church, which is also attested by the whole character of the epistle to the Romans, especially xv. 20, etc.; i. 8, 12; xv. 15, etc. And since this letter was already written in the year 57, the labors of the prince of the apostles must be assigned to the first years of the reign of Claudius.

¹ *Oros.* Hist. vii. 4. Exordio regni Claudii Petrus ap. D. u. J. Chr. Romanum venit et salutarem cunctis fidem fideli verbo docuit potentissimisque virtutibus approbabit. Atque exinde Christiani Romae esse coeperunt. Cf. *Eus.* H. E. ii. 14, 15. The statement of Jerome is clearer yet: *Simon Petrus post episcopatum Antiochenensis ecclesiae et praedicationem dispersionis eorum, qui de circumcisione crediderunt in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia et Bithynia secundo Claudii anno ad expugnandum Simonem Magam Romanum pergit ibique viginti quinque annis cathedralem tenuit usque ad ultimum annum Neronis.* Likewise in his work on the Chronicle of Eusebius. The Armenian translation of the *Chronicon* and its Latin text, edited by Cardinal Angelo Mai, place this journey in the third year of Caius, or in the year 40. Cf. *Ang. Mai*, *Collectio nova scriptorum veterum*, viii. 376. Romae, 1833. *J. B. Aucher*, *Eus. pamph. Chronicum bipartitum ex Armeniaco textu in lat. conversum*, etc. Venet. 1818. Petrus . . . Romanorum urbem profiscitur, ibique . . . antistes ecclesiae annis viginti (quinque), pars ii. p. 269. Cf. *Eus. Chronic. canonum quae supersunt*, ed. *Schoene*, pp. 150, 152. Berol. 1866. This review, which is brought forward from the *Chronicon*, indirectly confirms the statement of St. Jerome; since it places the death of the apostle in the thirteenth year of Nero's reign, — that is, a. d. 67, — and thus presumes the episcopal reign to have lasted twenty-five years; and it also places the ordination of St. Evodius, who succeeded St. Peter in Antioch as bishop (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 22), in the year 42. The Liberian Catalogue of Popes also speaks of the twenty-five years' episcopacy of Peter. Cf. ed. *Henschen*. That St. Peter was twice in Rome is testified by the ancient ecclesiastical feast of the most ancient Roman martyrology.

² *Sueton.* Claud. c. 25. *Judeos impulsore Christo assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.* Cf. *Tert. Ad. nat.* i. 3; *Lact. Inst.* iv. 7.

³ *Acts* xv. 7.

⁴ *Gal.* ii. 11.

⁵ *Lact.* De mort. persecut. Cum jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romanum advenit. Cf. *Hieron.* De vir. illustr. Petrus in Epistola prima sub nonine Babylonis figuraliter Romanum significans.

apostles went back to Rome, without, however, remaining uninterrupted there. There, however, according to the universal testimony of the ancient Church, against which not the faintest contradiction was uttered in the first centuries, he was imprisoned during the Neronian persecution, then crucified on the Vatican Hill, with his head downwards, on the 29th June, 67.¹

From Rome Peter sent his two epistles to all the faithful in Asia Minor; the first is dated from Babylon, which, according to *Papias*, Bishop of Hierapolis, and other ancient writers, is a figurative expression to denote Rome.

St. James the Less, first bishop of Jerusalem, was, according to the statement of Flavius Josephus (Antiq. xx. 9, 1), stoned to death by order of the high-priest Ananus (62).

St. John the Apostle and Evangelist, after the dispersion of the apostles, went to Ephesus, and for a time governed the Christian communities of Asia Minor. The Emperor Domitian had him brought to Rome, where he was cast into a vessel of boiling oil,² from which, when he was taken out uninjured, he was banished to the isle of Patmos, where he wrote his Apocalypse (Apoc. i. 9, 10). After the death of this tyrant St. John again took up his residence in Ephesus; and in contending against the errors of his day, he set forth the true nature of Jesus Christ. This, in fact, was the occasion of his writing his sublime Gospel, in which he so earnestly manifested that apostolic zeal and love of Christ which also shone forth so beautifully in his Epistles. He died, full of years, in 100 or 101,³ during the reign of the Emperor Trajan.

We have but scanty accounts concerning the achievements of the other apostles. According to Origen,⁴ St. Andrew labored in Scythia, St. Thomas in Parthia. In all probability Bartholomew preached the gospel in India and in southern Arabia.⁵ Philip went to Phrygia,⁶

¹ The Chronicle of Eusebius names the thirteenth year of Nero's reign (+ 9 June, 68) as that of the death of the apostles, while *Hieronymus* (De vir. illustr. c. 1, n. 5) indicates the fourteenth year as that on which the event took place. As Nero ascended the imperial throne on the 13th October, 54, the year 54 or 55 may, respectively, be considered as the first of his reign. Ancient tradition speaks for the year 67 as the correct date of the martyrdom. On the death of St. Peter, see *Orig. ap. Eus.* iii. 1; *Tert.* De praes. haeret.; *Lact.* De mort. pers. c. 6.

² *Tert.* De praes. haeret. c. 36.

³ Some sketches of his life by *Iren.* Adv. haer. iii. 3, 4; *Clemens Alex.* Quis dives salvabitur, c. 42; *Hieron.* in Gal. vi. 10.

⁴ *Ap. Eus.* H. E. iii. 1.

⁵ *Eus.* l. c. v. 10.

⁶ *Polycrates*, ap. *Eus.* l. c. iii. 30, 37; v. 25.

and died in Hierapolis. Matthew is said to have taught in Ethiopia;¹ Judas Thaddeus, in Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia. Of Simon Zelotes and Matthias it is only known that they travelled in the East.

Respecting the death of the Blessed Virgin-mother of the Savior, traditions differ. Some say she ended her life at Jerusalem, where her tomb is shown; according to another ancient tradition she went to Ephesus with St. John, and died there,—all the apostles, save only St. Thomas, being present at her last moments.

§ 9. *Dissolution of the Jewish Nation.—Destruction of Jerusalem.*

Not many periods of ten years had run their round since the ascension of our Divine Savior into heaven, before the prophecy (Matt. xxiv. 2; Luke xix. 43, 44, xxi. 6) he had uttered respecting the obdurate Jewish people was fulfilled: the kingdom of the Jews was overthrown, Jerusalem destroyed, and the Temple reduced to ashes.

The Romans were the instruments chosen by God to execute his judgments. For a considerable time previous, a savage-like enmity had existed between them and the demoralized Jews,² who were led further astray by their false³ Messias (Acts v. 36, 37; xxi. 28). It had long needed but a spark to kindle the conflagration.⁴

This was given by the cruel and avaricious Roman governor Gessius Florus.⁵ The Jews brought their just accusation before the Proconsul of Syria, Cestius Gallus, but were dismissed unheard, nay, were oppressed all the more grievously. They then broke out into open revolt. The rebels (66) took the fortress Masada, on the Dead Sea, by storm, and under the leadership of Eleazar possessed themselves of Jerusalem, laid siege to the fortress Antonia, and faithlessly murdered the Roman garrison. But a short time elapsed before the rebellion had spread over the entire country.⁶

¹ *Rufin.* H. E. i. 9.

² *Jos.* Bell. Jud. xi. 13, 3. *Arch.* xx. 8, 5, 6, 10. Bell. Jud. vii. 8, ; v. 10, 5, 13, 6. Josephus had been commander of the Galilean fortress, Jotapata. He fell a captive into Vespasian's hands, who used him as a mediator between himself and the Jews. (+ 93 after Christ.)

³ *Jos. Antiq.* xx. 5, 1, 8, 5, sqq.

⁴ *Tacitus, Hist.* v. 4, 5, 8, 9.

⁵ *Ibid.* v. 10.

⁶ *Jos. Bell. Jud.* ii. 17, 18, 19, describes the mutual assassinations between the Jews and Gentiles in other individual cities.

Nero confided the conduct of the war to Vespasian. But when this general was himself elected emperor, he named his son Titus as commander-in-chief. Under the command of the latter, the Romans besieged and took the city after a most determined resistance, which resistance had been the more remarkable, as Jerusalem at that time not only was a prey to famine and pestilence, but was torn with internal factions that tyrannized one over the other ; and the most horrible cruelties desecrated the holy city¹ (70). The Temple was destroyed by fire.

The Christians, mindful of the propheey of the Savior, had already (66 or 67) abandoned the fated city, and taken refuge in Pella, beyond the Jordan. Josephus estimates the number of those that perished during the siege at about a million. The triumphal arch of Titus is still standing at Rome, a memorial of the disastrous events that befell the Jewish people.

Under the Emperor Trajan bloody seditions among the Jews broke out in Cyrenaïka, Egypt, and Cyprus. When the Emperor Adrian (131) forbade circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath, and attempted to build the heathen city *Ælia Capitolina* on the ruins of Jerusalem, with the Temple of Jupiter on Mount Moriah, the whole of Palestine broke forth into rebellion.

At the head of the rebels stood the deceiver Bar-Cochba, whom the rabbi Akiba proclaimed to be the Messias. For six long years the war was continued with the greatest animosity and fury on both sides. It is estimated that 580,000 men were slaughtered on the field of battle, while a far greater number perished by want and sickness ; the rebels were conquered. The projected city was built, and the Jews were forbidden to enter it on pain of death.

The destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple brought with it very important consequences to the Christian Church, because (1) It was evidence of the divinity of our Lord, whose prophecies were thus fulfilled (Matt. xxvii. 25) ; (2) The distinction between the Jewish and the heathen converts was thus done away with ; and (3) The conflict respecting the ritual law was thus at an end.²

¹ For the cruelties exercised by the rebels on the miserable citizens, see *Jos. Bell. Jud. vi. 1* sqq. The famine was so great that a mother slaughtered her own child and ate half of it (*Jos. Bell. Jud. vi. 3, 4* ; *Eus. H. E. iii. 6*). The wonderful apparitions before the destruction of the city and the Temple are spoken of by *Jos. Bell. Jud. vi. 5, 3* ; *Tacit. Hist. v. 13* ; *Eus. H. E. iii. 8*. After the Temple was destroyed, the tribute formerly paid for its support was exacted for the support of the Temple of Jupiter *Capitolinus* in Rome.

² After the first destruction of Jerusalem, the principal seat of the Rabbins was

Eight months before the destruction of the Temple in Jernusalem, that of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome was consumed by fire.¹ The national sanctuaries of both Jew and pagan were thus demolished; it was for the Christian Church to take their place.

§ 10. *Spread of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.*

The prophetic words of our Lord Jesus Christ (John xii. 32), "If I shall be lifted up I will draw all things to me," began to be fulfilled soon after the foundation of the Church; for it is an undeniable fact that at the beginning of the fourth century the Christian religion had already found adherents in every one of the three parts of the then known world, and included among its members persons of every condition of life.²

The most ancient Fathers and writers of the Church — Justin, Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, Lactantius, and others — bear witness, in their apologetical and polemical writings, that the fact of the spread of Christianity in all directions was incontrovertible. It is also proved by the assertions of Celsus and Lucian, as well as by the official writings of Pliny (see § 13) to Trajan, that in their time there were Christians in every region of the Roman Empire. And that the number of Christians corresponded to the spread of the Church is demonstrated by the number of bishops who labored in the second and third centuries;³ by the number of heresies and schismatics of those times; and finally, by the long, numerous, and bloody persecutions suffered by the Church, which did not avail even to weaken, much less to destroy it.⁴ From the same sources we learn that the Christians of the first century did not by any means all belong to the poorer classes; that among them were some very distinguished men and women, besides many learned scholars.

Jammia, and after the second it was Tiberias. Here the Mishna came into existence, about 220. It was compiled from the decisions of the doctors of the law; this, with the commentary (Gemara) added in the fourth century, forms the Talmud. In Babylon the Mishna was also completed and explained; and thus the Babylonian Gemara united to the Mishna formed what has been called the Babylonian Talmud, to distinguish it from the Talmud of Jerusalem, which originated in Palestine. The Babylonian Talmud is the rule for the Jews.

¹ *Tacitus*, Hist. iii. 71.

² *Fabrii*, *Salutaris lux evang.* Hamb. 1731. *Mamachi*, *Orig. et antiqu.* ii. 1 sqq.

³ Cf. §§ 33, 37.

⁴ *Tert. Apol.* c. 50. *Cruciate, torquete, atterite nos . . . plures efficimur quoties metimur a vobis.*

The principal church of Asia was that of Antioch in Syria, in which St. Ignatius, the second successor of St. Peter, presided; besides this, the churches of Jerusalem (Ælia) and of Cæsarea (Stratonis) were flourishing. Christianity was also early known in Edessa; for in 160 a Christian prince reigned here. From Syria the Christian religion was transplanted to Mesopotamia and Persia (Seleucia and Ctesiphon).

In Roman Armenia Christian communities already existed in the second century. The churches in Cilicia, Lycania, Isauria, Pisidia, Asia Proconsularis (Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Phrygia), are of apostolic origin. Pliny and Lucian speak of the number of Christians in Bithynia (Nicomedia, Nice) and Pontus (New Cæsarea). Also in Galatia and Cappadocia (Cæsarea), in Cyprus and Crete, the apostles preached the faith. In Arabia there were Christian churches as early as 220.

The first apostle who preached the Christian doctrine in Europe was St. Peter, the founder of the Roman Church, which numbered many members of the most distinguished circles. From Rome the knowledge of Christianity extended to other Italian cities, who pride themselves on having an apostolical origin. Macedonia and Greece were visited by St. Paul, who also preached in Spain. Nineteen Spanish bishops were present at the Council of Elvira (306).

In Gaul, although Dionysius the Areopagite was probably not the apostle there, the churches of Lyons and Vienne soon rose to eminence. About the middle of the third century Pope Fabian is said to have sent seven bishops into various districts of Gaul. In the time of Cyprian there were already a considerable number of bishops there. Tertullian informs us that not only in Roman Britain, but in that part which was unsubdued, many Christian communities existed, and that in the Diocletian persecution not a few, both of the clerics and of the laity, were martyred.¹ In the two Germanies, lying on the left bank of the Rhine as far as Belgium, Christianity had been received as early as the time of St. Irenæus, as he himself relates. The churches of Spires, Mayence, Treves, Cologne, and Tongres are very ancient. Also on the right bank of the Rhine, in that part of Germany unsubdued by the Romans, Christian communities were found. Into the regions round the Danube Christianity was probably introduced by Roman soldiers and refugees. The most ancient

¹ *Eus. Demonstrat. evang.* iii. 7. *Beda Venerabilis, Hist. eec.* i. 6, 7. *Lingard, Hist. of Anglo-Saxon Ch.* Venerable Bede states that Lucius, a British prince, asked and obtained Christian teachers from Pope Eleutherius (177-192).

church in Noricum is that of Loreh (Laureacum), near Lintz, whose bishop, St. Maximilian, was martyred at Celeja (Cilly, in Styria), 285. The same fate occurred to Bishop Victorinus of Petavio, in Pannonia (+ 303), and Quirinus, Bishop of Siscia (+ 303). In Brigantium, Constance, and Angusta Vindelicorum (Augsburg), many fell victims to the Diocletian persecution; among whom may be named St. Afra.

Africa also received the apostles of faith from Rome. The first bishop of Alexandria was St. Mark¹ the Evangelist, who was sent thither by St. Peter. But in Lower Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, Christianity encountered strong opposition from the Jews, and later on from the Gnostics. It made greater conquests, however, in the proconsulate of Africa, in Numidia and Mauritania. Here, already, at the beginning of the third century, Carthage was the metropolitan see, around which were clustered numerous bishoprics.

We have very sparing news of the earliest missionaries of the gospel; the reason of which may lie in the circumstance that Christianity made its way without noise,² and that more or less every Christian took part in diffusing the knowledge of Christ. The Christian slave, the artisan, and the soldier were not less zealous in spreading the faith than were Christian merchants, official persons, and philosophers. A prominent position in this diffusion of Christianity was taken by women. According to Origen and Eusebius, there were not a few Christians who, after dividing their possessions among the poor, devoted themselves exclusively to missionary labors, either by traversing pagan countries and preaching the gospel there, or by completing a work already begun among fugitives and prisoners of war.

§ 11. *Causes of the Rapid Spread of Christianity. — Obstacles retarding its Progress.*

The relatively rapid and universal acceptance of Christianity cannot be solely or even principally referred to natural causes; although assuredly such exterior favorable circumstances as that of the world-wide Roman government, of the active intercourse between different nations, and of the almost universal use of the Greek language, together with the connecting links which heathen-

¹ *Eus.* H. E. ii. 16, 24; iii. 14, 21. Cf. *Jerome*, Ep. 101.

² *Tert.* Ad Scapulam, c. 2. Cum tanta hominum multitudo, pars paene major civitatis cuiusque, in silentio et modestia agimus.

ism itself offered to the messengers of the gospel, were doubtless of great significance; but alone they did not effect the wonderful recognition of its truth. Ancient writers bring forward many other reasons which weighed with men and moved them to adore "the Crucified One." According to them, the deepest and truest motive which led the heathen into the Church was the divine character of Christianity. The Fathers and writers of those times adduce the following causes as the main ones which led the heathen to Christ:—

1. The Christian doctrine in itself, which, as a positive revelation from God, stood opposed to all heathenish opinions and fables, while it contented the needs of the spirit and the heart, and in spite of the profundity of its teaching was equally accessible to all classes of men.¹

2. The gift of miracles with which so many confessors of Christ were endowed, particularly the power of Christians to cast out devils.²

3. The glorious fruits which were brought forth by Christianity, particularly the supernatural lives of Christians, their zeal and their willingness to suffer,³ to which may be added their love for each other, but, above all, the manner in which they set up their faith beyond all other interests, and were willing, nay, oftentimes desirous, to bear testimony to its truth by martyrdom.

But in order to understand better yet how unjustly Gibbon and his followers ascribe the wonderful spread of Christianity to merely natural causes, it will suffice to cast a glance over the many obstacles which retarded its progress.

First, it is self-evident that the above-named exterior circumstances which favored the growth of Christianity, presented equal facilities in opposing it. Besides, the circumstance that Christianity came to be regarded as a new and foreign religion, mimical to the outgrown heathenism so intimately interwoven in the State and family life, was quite likely to keep the pagans themselves aloof. And this took place so much the more in that the Church set up a very high moral standard for her adherents, forbidding them to visit the so greatly

¹ *Tert.* *Apol.* c. 46. *Deum quilibet opifex Christianus et invenit et ostendit.*

² *Pupias*, ap. *Eus.* *H. E.* iii. 39; cf. iii. 31. The early Fathers frequently appeal to the miracles wrought by the Christians: e. g. *Just.* *Apol.* xi. 6; *Dial.* c. *Tryph.* c. 121; *Iren.* *Adv. haer.* xi. 32, 4.

³ *Tert.* *Apol.* c. 39. *Vide, inquitnt (scil. the heathen), ut invicem se diligent . . . et ut per alterntro mori sint parati.*

prized theatres and gladiatorial combats, to take part in the public festivals, while she forbade, nay, rendered it impossible for them to undertake certain honorable offices of the State; on the other hand, paganism flattered human sensuality, and gave free indulgence to the passions by its sensuous worship and idolatrous festivals, which to many minds still invested them with a charm.¹ To these obstacles were added calumny, scientific polemies, and bloody persecution.

The Jews² had already hurled the most infamous accusations at the Christians, which also found credence with the pagans; the pagan priesthood and all who derived advantage from the service of idols repeated these calumnies with additions, and most sedulously gave them currency. These accusations were, in the main, that the Christians sought the overthrow of all religion; that they were atheists; that they were guilty of high-treason, of enmity against the State, and, lastly, of thyestic³ repasts, of incest and other crimes, which they were said to commit when they assembled together.

Whilst the followers of Christ were branded as enemies of the human race and as demoralized beings, pagan philosophy took refuge in sophistry, and what it termed learned confutations, in order to convict the Church of senseless and absurd doctrines.

At last, in order to stifle the Church in her own blood, the pagan potentates issued their edicts of persecution, of which the last was ever more cruel, more bloody, than the previous one had been.

Thus the Church found enemies everywhere; but in His strength who has overcome the world, the plans of her enemies have been baffled and brought to nought.⁴

¹ *Min. Felix.* Oct. c. 12. *Tert. Apol.* c. 35, 38. *Orig. c. Cels.* viii. 21.

² *Aeta martyr. s. Polycarpi,* c. 12, 13. *Orig. c. Cels.* vi. 27.

³ Thyestes was entertained by his brother at a repast in which his own son was served up to him.

⁴ *Hilarius, De Trin.* I. vii. p. 917, ed. *Constant.* Hoc enim ecclesiae proprium est, ut tune vineat quum laeditur, tune intelligatur cum arguitur, tune obtineat cum deseritur.

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

§ 12. *Condition of the Church in the Roman Empire.—Persecution of the Christians.*

In the first flush of their rise the Roman people looked upon the Christians as a Jewish sect, and did not molest them. It is even said that the Emperor Tiberius contemplated placing Christ among the Roman gods.¹ It was but a few years afterwards, however, that a fearful persecution broke out against the Church; this lasted, with but brief intervals of respite, for three hundred years, and was intended utterly to root out Christianity.

The chief reasons for this cruel persecution, as given by Christian and heathen authors, are as follows:—

1. A blind fury of the excited and superstitious heathenish populace, which looked on every calamity as a punishment from the gods calling on them to destroy the Christians;² to this may be added the cruelty and fanaticism of some Roman emperors, whom the Christians refused to adore.

2. The law of the State enacted against high-treason, sacrilege, and magic,³ chiefly the law forbidding the introduction of a new religion without the sanction of the government, to which under Trajan was added the prohibition of secret associations.⁴

3. To these reasons may be added that from the time of Decius to that of Diocletian it was the very general conviction of the Roman emperors, that the existence and well-being of the Roman State were incompatible with the tolerance of the Christian religion, which therefore must be got rid of at any price.

In view of these causes of the persecutions against the Christian Church, the assertion made by Gibbon and others that the spread of the Christian religion is mainly attributable to natural causes falls to the ground.

§ 13. *Persecutions from Nero to Decius.*

The first direct persecution against the Christians broke out towards the end of the year 64, under the cruel emperor Nero

¹ *Tert. Apol.* c. 5.

² *Ibid.* c. 40. Si Tiberis ascendit ad moenia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si caelum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim Christianos ad leonem.

³ *Julius Paulus, Sentent. recept.* v. 29, 1, ad legem Julianam majestatis. The crime could be committed *facto, et verbis impiis.*

⁴ *Min. Felix, Oct.* c. 8. *Tert. Apol.* vi. 38.

(54-68). The proximate occasion was the great fire of Rome, the blame of which the tyrant, probably influenced by his Jewish courtiers, was willing to throw upon the hated, because vilely calumniated, followers of Christ. It is uncertain whether this persecution, in which an immense multitude met their deaths in the most frightful torments,¹ and in which Peter and Paul also received the martyr's crown, was confined to the capital city, or otherwise ; it is not improbable, however, that it extended beyond Rome.²

After a short respite under Vespasian and Titus, a terrible persecution against the Christians was set on foot under Domitian³ (81-96), which also extended to the provinces. On the charge of atheism, he put to death even his own near relative, Flavius Clement, and banished the martyr's wife to the island Pandataria. The Apostle St. John was exiled to Patmos, while, singularly enough, some relatives of Jesus succeeded in convincing the mistrustful emperor that they did not aspire to the throne of Judæa.⁴

To Domitian succeeded Nerva⁵ (96-98), who set at liberty those who had been condemned for atheism and Judaism, forbade further accusations in these respects, and recalled the exiles. But the lot of the Christians under Trajan (98-117) became all the more severe for this. This emperor put in force the law of secret associations against them. It was only on receiving the most interesting letter of the younger Pliny,⁶ Governor of Bithynia, that the emperor reduced his harsh measures to a better-regulated mode of proceeding, by forbidding that search should be made for Christians, or that they should be arraigned on anonymous information. But as he also ordained that those accused of being Christians, who remained faithful to their religion, should be punished, the chief advantage of the imperial edict was in its withdrawing the accused from the fury of the populace, and rescuing them from the caprice of arbitrary governors (+ St. Simeon of Jerusalem and St. Ignatius of Antioch).

The Emperor Adrian (117-138), influenced by an official report from Serennius Granianus, Proconsul of Asia Minor, in a rescript to his successor, Minucius Fundanus, also forbade all illegal proceedings⁷ against the Christians, who were at that time grievously persecuted in Palestine by the Jewish rebels under Bar-Cochba.

¹ *Tacitus*, Ann. xv. 44.

² *Oros. Hist.* vii. 7.

³ *Dio Cass. Hist. Rom.* 67, 1.

⁴ *Eus. H. E.* iii. 1 sqq.

⁵ *Ibid.* 68, 1.

⁶ *Plin. Ep. lib.* x. 97.

⁷ *Just. Apol.* i. 69, and *Eus. H. E.* iv. 9.

The vexations continued under Antoninus Pius (138–161), the successor of Adrian, notwithstanding that the emperor was inclined to protect the Christians. St. Justin addressed to him an apology in their behalf; and the emperor issued an edict, in their favor, to certain cities of Greece. The rescript to the Greek communities in Asia Minor was yet more favorable; but its genuineness has been called in question.

In contradistinction to his predecessors, Marcus Aurelius (161–180), the Stoic philosopher and zealous servant of the gods, commanded that the Christians should be sought out, and either put to death or made to renounce their faith; and this because he looked on them as stubborn men, dangerous to the State. This imperial fanaticism, united to the avarice of some governors and to some public calamities which popular fury attributed to the Christians, contributed to render this persecution one of great cruelty. Neither the numerous apologies of Christian writers nor the miracle of the Legio fulminatrix, wrought in answer to the prayer of the Christian soldiers (174), which rescued the emperor and the army from the imminent death to which they were exposed for want of drinkable water, effected a lasting change in the mind of the emperor, as shortly after this event the Christians were persecuted at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul, in a most cruel and horrible manner, at which time St. Pothinus, St. Blandina, and St. Ponticus received the crown of martyrdom.¹

His son Commodus (180–192) issued no new edict against the Christians, being influenced by Marcia (his wife of lowly birth). Nevertheless, the cruelty of some governors remained unrestrained. Eusebius relates that at this time many noble and wealthy citizens embraced Christianity. The Senator Apollonius was put to death as a Christian under the very eyes of the emperor; and in the civil war which broke out after the death of Commodus, many Christians suffered death.²

Their situation became somewhat more favorable in the first years of the rule of Septimius Severus³ (193–211), who had been cured of a painful disease by a Christian slave. At this time only the cruel governors and the furious populace oppressed the faithful; but soon the emperor himself changed his mind, and in the year 202 he issued an edict⁴ strictly forbidding any one to embrace either the Jewish or the Christian religion. This was the occasion of a new tragedy,

¹ According to De Rossi, *Roma Sotter*, II., 147 sqq., St. Cecily was martyred in 178, not under Alex. Severus, as others believe. ² *Clem. Alex. Strom.* lib. ii.

³ *Tert. Ad. Scap.* c. 4.

⁴ *Spartian.* *Severus.* c. 17.

the scene of which was principally in Africa (St. Perpetua, St. Felicitas, the Scillitan martyrs, Sts. Potamiana, Leonidas, the father of Origen, fell as victims) and in Gaul also St. Irenaeus, 202.¹

After Septimius, several men ascended the imperial throne who were less zealous for the maintenance of the Roman worship, being more intent on forming a syncretism, or fusion of all religions, on which account they did not proceed of themselves so hard against Christianity. Yet the State laws were still enforced against many of its adherents. This was the case under Caracalla (211–217) and under Heliogabalus (218–222), which latter emperor contemplated, in all earnestness, the fusion of the Christian religion with that of the Syrian worship of the sun. The same took place under Alexander Severus² (222–235), who bestowed on the Christians many tokens of his good-will towards them.

This peace was somewhat disturbed in Pontus and Cappadocia by Maximinus Thrax, the assassin of Alexander Severus. Happily, the brutal soldier died in 238. He was succeeded by Gordian (238–244) and by Philipus Arabs (244–249), under whom the Christians enjoyed peace.

§ 14. *Persecutions from Decius to Diocletian.*

Trajan Decius (249–251) followed a much more systematic and more cruel plan in endeavoring to exterminate the Christians than any of his predecessors, for he deemed their existence incompatible with the well-being of the Roman Empire.³ In order to extirpate them in the quickest possible manner⁴ he gave orders, under severe penalties, that every available means⁵ should be used to induce Christians to renounce their religion, and particularly that their clergy should be brought forward.⁶ The means put in force, which were promises, threats, and the sharpest tortures that could be found, did not altogether fail in producing the desired effect. A goodly number of Christians, even bishops and priests, fell away and sacrificed to the gods or offered incense to them, whilst others by bribery obtained false testimonials stating that they had obeyed

¹ *Eus.* H. E. vi. 1. *Ruinart*, *Acta Martyrum*. *Greg. Turon.* *Hist. Franc.* 1–27.

² Under Alex. Severus, Domitius Ulpianus (*De officio proconsulis*, II. vii.) collected all the imperial edicts against the Christians. *Lact. Inst.* v. 11.

³ *Lact. De mort. pers.* c. 4.

⁴ *Eus.* H. E. vi. 39, 41, 42. *Oros. Hist.* vii. 21.

⁵ *Cyp. Ep.* 8.

⁶ *Ibid.* 52.

the emperor's command.¹ The greater number, however, remained steadfast,² preferring to suffer the most cruel torments and death to apostasy; and thus the imperial tyrant, who lost his life in a battle with the Goths, was but a tool in the hand of God to winnow the chaff from the wheat.³

Under Gallus (+ 253) the persecution continued.⁴ Valerian (253–260) was at first favorable to the Christians; but, falling under the influence of the magician Maerian, an Egyptian, he began by issuing an edict, 257, forbidding religious assemblies under penalty of confiscation of property, and banishment of the priests with those of the laity who were of high rank; desiring by these measures to weaken Christianity. When this project failed he pronounced the punishment of death on all Christians.⁵ Then it was that Pope Sixtus, with his deacon Laurence, St. Cyprian, and others, died the death of martyrs.

The succeeding emperor, Gallienus (260–268), son of Valerian, commanded that the confiscated buildings and cemeteries⁶ should be restored to the Christians, and issued an edict of tolerance which continued in force under Aurelian (270–275), who was prevented by death from carrying out his inimical plans,⁷ and under the following emperors until Diocletian.

Even this despotic ruler, who in the year 286 associated Maximian Herculius with himself as Augustus, and in union with him named in 292 his son-in-law Galerius and Constantius Chlorus as Caesars, was, in despite of his love for paganism, not disinclined to the Christians; he permitted them to exercise their worship, and even elevated some of them to high and influential positions. Numberless crowds of every condition of life now embraced Christianity. The churches could no longer contain the multitudes, and were replaced by buildings of larger dimensions and of more magnificent architecture. But, alas! this prosperity of almost forty years brought relaxation and sloth and negligence in its train. Then the chastisements of God were poured forth.⁸ After a long resistance to the urgent solicitations of Galerius and the fanatical heathens, Diocletian yielded to their representations, and resolved on a new

¹ *Cyp.* De lapsis, c. 8. *Cyp.* Ep. 18, 21, 26. *Eus.* H. E. vi. 41.

² *Eus.* H. E. vi. 39, 41.

³ *Cyp.* De lapsis, c. 6.

⁴ *Dionys.* Alex. ap. *Eus.* vii. 1. *Cyp.* Ep. 57, 58.

⁵ *Dionys.* Alex. ap. *Eus.* vii. 10, 11.

⁶ *Eus.* H. E. vii. 13.

⁷ *Eus.* H. E. vii. 30. *Lact.* De mort. pers. c. 6.

⁸ *Eus.* H. E. viii. 1.

persecution of the Christians, hoping by their extermination to establish the State on a firmer basis and endow it with additional splendor.¹ Hostilities began with the law (298) which commanded the Christian soldiers, the Theban legion,² who had already had much to suffer, to offer sacrifices to the gods. But they took a more public character when on the great feast of the Terminalia (303) the magnificent church of Nicomedia was demolished.³ Three imperial edicts were immediately put forth, each one following quickly on the heels of the other. The first commanded the demolition of the Christian churches, the destruction of their books, and deprived Christians of all their dignities and civic rights. After the burning of the imperial palace, the revolts in Armenia and Syria and the resistance of some Christians to the enforcement of the laws against them were adroitly made use of to fasten on the faithful the accusation of being conspirators against the empire. This called forth the second edict, which enacted that all the bishops and priests should be cast into prison; to this was quickly added the third edict, which left to the clergy only the alternative of apostasy or death in torments. This last was soon followed up by another, extending these threats to all Christians (304).

Then, to use the words of Lactantius, “in the East, and, with the exception of Gaul, in the West also, three wild beasts were raging furiously against all the faithful,” and novel kinds of martyrdom were invented to torture them with.

Numerous Christians out of every condition of life were tortured to death in most fearful forms of martyrdom; and, alas! not a few were also led away to sacrifice to the gods, or induced to deliver up the Holy Scriptures.⁴ More fearful yet than rack, sword, or funeral-pile was the agony of soul to which Christian women and virgins were exposed. The whole kingdom of hell seemed let loose to take the Church by storm. But even these measures were in vain. As Eusebius observed, “the murderous weapons were at length blunted and worn out; they broke to pieces. The executioners became weary of their office, and had to leave off.” The constancy of the Christians remained unconquered; and the tyrants, becoming weary of slaughter, contented themselves with mutilating the Christians, the very name of whom they had thought to extirpate from the earth. Among the inscriptions of this time are found: Nomine

¹ *Lact.* l. c. c. 11.

² *Greg. Turon.* *De gloria mart.* c. 62.

³ *Eus.* H. E. viii., x., and *Lact.* l. c. c. 7 sqq.

⁴ They were called *traditores*.

Christianorum delecto, superstitione Christiana ubique deleta et cultu deorum propagato.

After the two emperors (305) had resigned the thrones which were then ascended by the two Cæsars, the persecution of the Christians ceased in the West under Constantius and his son Constantine the Great (from 306). But it raged all the more violently in the East under Galerius and his nephew the brutal Cæsar Maximinus Daja, who even commanded that the food exposed for sale in the market should be sprinkled with sacrificial wine or water.

Galerius, having been brought to his senses by the pain endured during a loathsome sickness, published some months before his death (311) the edict of toleration, which, however, did not prevent Maximin from renewing the persecution after his uncle's death. Once again the Christians who had just quitted the prisons and rebuilt their churches were made to feel what pagan fury was. The emperor and proconsuls were not even content with the wholesale slaughter of the followers of Christ; they also published fictitious documents, like the so-called "Acta Pilati," full of lies and blasphemies against Christ, which they disseminated in all directions, even putting them in the hands of school-children; and by bribing infamous persons they also brought forward shameful accusations against the Christians. The hypocrite Maxentius, who ruled Italy after his victory over Cæsar Severus, was also a cruel persecutor of the Christians.

But the hour of deliverance was at hand. Constantine and his son-in-law Licinius, whom Galerius had nominated as Augustus, issued by mutual agreement, in the spring of 312, a toleration edict, according to which each one should be free to follow the religion he professed. Naturally the Christians were, in this way, free to follow theirs. Then in October followed Constantine's wonderful victory¹ over Maxentius on the Pons Milvius. Hereupon the emperor made his triumphal entry into Rome, where the Senate had erected a statue in his honor, with a cross in his hand, under which he had the following inscription placed: "Through this sign of salvation, the symbol of true courage, have I delivered your city, and freed it from the yoke of a tyrant."

In the next year (313) the two emperors issued the famous Edict of Milau, by which perfect religious freedom was conferred on the Christians. Every one was permitted to become a Christian, and

¹ *Eus. Vita Const.* i. 27 sqq.

the restoration of all confiscated churches and other property was commanded.¹ The privileges granted by this edict were extended to the entire East after Licinius had defeated Maximin at Adrianople, 313.²

Augustine, in his "City of God," xviii. 52, enumerates ten persecutions of the Christians: 1. Nero; 2. Domitian; 3. Trajan; 4. Marc Aurelius; 5. Severus; 6. Maximin Thrax; 7. Decius; 8. Valerian; 9. Aurelian; 10. Diocletian.

§ 15. *Christian Martyrdom.*

These cruel persecutions were the cause, it is true, that many Christians showed themselves weak, and either fell away from, or dissembled, their faith; but the great majority remained steadfast, and for Christ's dear sake joyfully surrendered their possessions, their liberty, nay, life itself.

Those who had for the sake of the faith suffered confiscation, imprisonment, and banishment, and more especially those who had endured martyrdom, were always honored with a high veneration, even from the earliest times, which was made manifest (1) In the very name, Martyr or Confessor,³ which was bestowed upon them; (2) In the high value which was set on their intercession;⁴ (3) In the solemn ceremonies with which they were entombed, in the celebration of the day of the martyrs' death,⁵ in visiting their graves, and in glorifying their courage by word and writing; also in the respect shown them by their yet living brethren, who often erected chapels and churches over the martyrs' tombs.

This homage which the Church paid to martyrdom, while she discountenanced all self-adulation, is not only justified by the circumstance that those dying thus had given so beautiful an example of their fidelity, but also by the fact that Christian martyrdom is

¹ *Eus.* H. E. x. 5. *Lact.* De mort. pers. c. 48.

² *Eus.* H. E. ix. 9, 10. *Lact.* De mort. pers. c. 46. Maximinus ejusmodi votum Jovi vovit, ut, si victoriam cepisset, Christianorum nomen extingueret funditusque deleret.

³ Fidelissimi, fortissimi, beatissimi martyres Benedicti, benedictae. *Tert.* Ad mart. *Cyp.* De exhort. mart.

⁴ *Tert.* Ad mart. c. 1. Quam pacem quidem in ecclesia non habentes, a martyribus in carcere exorare conseruerunt.

⁵ *Tert.* De coron. militum, c. 3. Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus.

a glorification of the whole Christian Church, is a characteristic of the religion of Jesus.¹

Martyrdom is, in fact, the fiery ordeal, the criterion by which the power of God in Christianity is gloriously made manifest. The brilliancy of the Church shines forth in an especial manner in the exalted courage with which it endowed such numbers of its confessors to sustain torture and face death for the faith, which faith it rendered triumphant at last, notwithstanding so many bloody persecutions (John xvi. 33).

Not less significant was the office of martyrdom in purifying the Church; like a cleansing fire, it separated the genuine gold from the dross, and cast out the impure elements which would have been so dangerous if left in her bosom at so early a date.

Lastly, it is a proof not to be undervalued of the stability and visibility of the Church, an evidence of the all-consoling truth that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it (Matt. xvi. 18).

In order to weaken these proofs of the power of martyrdom, the enemies of the Church have either diminished considerably the number of martyrs, or ascribed their death to false grounds; nay, they have sometimes imputed martyrdom to the heretical sects.

All attempts of this kind have, however, utterly failed. Dodwell's dissertation on the small number of martyrs is contradicted by the unanimous testimony of all antiquity. The assertion that the martyrs were actuated by a blind fanaticism is refuted not only by the duration and manner of the persecution, but also by the character, age, and condition of the martyrs. The so-called martyrs of heresy want the essential marks of a genuine testimony by blood-shedding.²

§ 16. *Scientific Attacks upon the Church by the Pagan Polemic Writers.*

Whilst the Roman emperors and proconsuls assailed the Christian religion by the sword, the sophists and philosophers of heathendom strove to destroy it by arguments addressed to the intellect. These intellectual combats were conducted in a twofold manner,—that is, either directly, by endeavoring to confute Christianity; or indirectly, by striving to give a spiritual signification to polytheism.

¹ Acta martyri. s. *Polyc.* c. 4. C. Matt. x. 23.

² Aug. in Psl. 34, n. 18. *Martyr in non facit poena sed causa.*

One of the principal enemies of the Christians was the philosopher Celsus (150), who in his polemical work, "The Word of Truth," puts the most malicious calumnies against the person of Christ in the mouth of a Jew, whom he introduced among the interlocutors in order to attack Christianity from a Jewish point of view. According to his representation, Christ was a common conjurer, of suspicious origin, who gave out that he was God, and went about with some ten or eleven poverty-stricken and miserable publicans and fishermen, performing some fictitious miracles and dying by the hand of the public executioner. His doctrine was a "barbarous jumble" of fable and absurdity, contravening every rational principle, and only calculated to captivate simple and stupid people. What it contains of truth is to be found long ago in the writings of pagan philosophers. He asserts that the moral law of the Christians is neither holy nor new. The adherents to this religion, who are for the most part composed of the dregs of the people, seek to make proselytes even in a shameless manner, and direct their views in a special manner to criminals and vicious men, who are the ones they most affect to receive into their communities. Added to this is their delusion that their sect, which so boldly bids defiance to the laws of the State, is destined to become the common property of all the nations on the face of the earth. This slanderous book, which betrays how little knowledge the author really possessed of Christianity, was refuted a hundred years later by Origen.

The work of the witty but superficial Lucian of Samosata is of a different cast. It is entitled "On the death of Peregrinus Proteus;" and its object is less to refute than to ridicule the Christians, whom he describes as good-hearted blockheads, ready to fall a prey to every charlatan. The frivolous scoffer makes merry over the enthusiasm which sustains them in martyrdom, as also at their mutual love one for the other, bearing thus, albeit unintentionally, a beautiful testimony to the power of Christianity and to the virtues of its adherents.

As the old calumnies and misrepresentations gradually lost their hold on the public mind, a more formidable opponent to Christianity appeared in the pretensions to a purer religion which arose to some extent among philosophical pagan writers. The Neo-Pythagorean system, which Apollonius of Tyana had endeavored to propagate in the first century, was superseded in the third by Neoplatonism.

This school of the Neoplatonists had for its object the overthrow of Christianity by the revival of paganism, to which it thought to add new strength ; and although it failed in this attempt, this was by far the most effectual weapon which pagan science ever brought to bear against the Church.

Neither Ammonius Saccas (+ 243) — the founder, according to history, of the Neoplatonic school — nor his disciple Plotinus (+ 261), made direct attacks upon Christianity. But the Syrian Porphyrius (+ 304), pupil of the latter, wrote “fifteen books against the Christians,” of which only a few fragments remain.

In common with the earlier polemical writers, Porphyrius cherished hatred to Christianity ; but he was far superior to them in ability, in having a deeper knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and of Christian dogma. Against these he exercised the weapons of his sophistry. In doing this the learned Neoplatonist makes no scruple of laying the burden of all the calamities of the empire on the Christians, and of renewing the ancient calumnies against them.

Against the Messiahship of Christ he opposes the lateness of his coming ; and he finds the eternity of hell-torments irreconcileable with the justice of God. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body was to him a stumbling-block. Porphyrius, who, according to St. Augustine and others, was an apostate Christian, controverted the prophecies of Daniel, adduced isolated passages of the Scripture to refute Christianity and to destroy the authority of the Scriptures. He denied the supernatural and divine character of the miracles, which he ascribed to magic, as he did the wonders worked at the tombs of the martyrs to the power of the demons.

To refute the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, which receives such lustre from his most wonderful life, the pagan philosophers now had recourse to another means. They drew a parallel between the lives of some heathens and that of our Lord. This tendency is plainly seen in the biography of Apollonius of Tyana (+ under Nerva), which was composed by Flavius Philostratus at the desire of the Empress Julia Domna, wife of Septimius Severus, the polemic tendency of which cannot be denied. The hero all through is represented as a demigod, who was born in a miraculous manner, who passed his youth in holy retirement, preached a sublime doctrine, worked miracles, and ended his life in a mysterious fashion.

With a similar design Porphyrius and Jamblicus idealized the

philosopher Pythagoras, till they invested him with all the attributes of a divine being. According to their description, Pythagoras is a perfect supernatural hero, who appeared on earth in human form, prophesied, wrought miracles in behalf of suffering humanity, and reconciled jarring parties. Lastly, he founded, in Lower Italy, his model State, the inhabitants of which had all their goods in common and paid him divine honors.¹

Other pagan philosophical works against the Christians are of minor importance.

The misrepresentations of Christianity as given by the above-named writers were widely used by others as sources of attacking the Christian faith. An instance of this is afforded by Hierocles, Governor of Bithynia under Diocletian. In his lying and calumniating work, "Friend of Truth," he not only repeats the reproaches and insults of Celsus, but, relying on the work of Philostratus, he places Apollonius above Christ, since Apollonius had worked still greater miracles, and yet was only held to be a favorite of the gods.

§ 17. *Defence of the Christian Religion by the Apologists.*

In order to bring the Roman potentates to a milder treatment of the Christians, as also to instruct the thinkers among the heathen in the true doctrines and practices of Christianity, learned Christian men in the second and third centuries drew up sundry writings in defence of the faith, which they named Apologies. These were addressed partly to the emperors, partly also to private persons; the object being to prove the falsehood of the accusations made against Christianity and exhibit her high and exalted privileges.

The Apologists, in pleading for the innocence of Christians, laid great stress on the main argument, that the judicial proceedings against them were conducted in an unlawful manner, in that the prosecutor only sought to compel the accused to renounce the name of Christ,² without instituting any inquiry as to any crime alleged to have been committed by them, or permitting them to defend themselves.

They defended the Christians against the different charges of atheism and immorality, high-treason, and enmity to the State, by pointing to the innocence of their lives and the faithful allegiance

¹ *Porphyry. Vita Pyth. Jam. Vita Pyth.*

² *Athen. Leg. pro Chr. c. 1, 2. Tert. Apol. c. 2.*

shown to the emperors in all lawful matters,¹ their observance of the laws and customs, in praying² for the emperor and in payment of taxes.³

The Apologies, however, were not intended merely to refute the objections and calumnies of their enemies; they were also written to show the divine origin of the Church in contradistinction to the absurdities and inconsistencies of the prevalent system of worship.

To prove the divinity of Christ, the Apologists showed that all the prophecies regarding the Messias (the one who was to come) of the Old Testament were fulfilled in Christ and in him alone, and this unto the minutest detail. Further, they appealed confidently to the miracles wrought by him, and to the prophecies he uttered as evidences of his divine nature, since none can know the future but God only.

The objection of novelty brought against the Church was replied to by tracing the links between the new and the old covenant, thus leading one back to the origin of the world, to the first revelation, the first sin, the consequences of which *required* redemption, which was to come in the fulness of time, when it had been fully manifested that man could not redeem himself.

To this was added a concise explanation of the principal doctrines of Christianity, of the religion of truth, which is an exposition of the sublime doctrines of the unity of the triune God, with the harmonies it enfolds, of the creation, together with an account of the fall, incarnation, redemption, and resurrection, whereof even heathenism had retained some grains of gold, though, being warped and distorted in their application, they could not stand the test of comparison with the revelation of God.

The Apologists are more reserved respecting the interior organization of the Church, on account of the *Disciplina arcani* (the Discipline of the Secret), and limited themselves to the absolutely necessary. St. Justin speaks more openly on these matters, on the sacraments, and the worship rendered by Christians to God.

Great stress was also laid by the Apologists on the effects produced by Christianity in transforming and ennobling the human heart and spirit, also on the fact of the gift of miracles still left in the Church; these, and the rapidity with which Christianity had spread over the nations of the earth, were adduced as proofs of its truth.

¹ *Theoph.* Ad Autol. i. 11. *Just.* *Apot.* i. 17. *Tatian,* *Orat. cont. Graecos*, c. 4.

² *Just.* *Apot.* i. 17. *Athen.* *Leg. pro Chr.* c. 37.

³ *Just.* *Apot.* i. 17. *Tert. Apol.* c. 42.

The names of the principal Apologists whose works are still extant are:—

GREEK APOLOGISTS.

1. The unknown author of the letter to Diognetus, in which he presents a beautiful description of Christian life.
2. Justin Martyr (about 166), an eloquent writer.
3. Tatian the Syrian, a disciple of Justin, and subsequently a heretic, who contrasts Christianity with paganism.
4. Athenagoras of Athens, who refutes calumnies and defends the resurrection.
5. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch: three books to the pagan Autolyeus.
6. Clement of Alexandria, who endeavors to win favor by portraying the beauty and sublimity of Christianity.
7. Origen, the celebrated scholar of Clement, who joyfully predicts the final victory of Christianity over the world.

LATIN APOLOGISTS.

8. Minucius Felix, an elegant writer.
9. Tertullian, skilled in juridical and logical methods of disputation.
10. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, demonstrated the vanity of idolatry.
11. Arnobius, the African rhetorician, and his disciple Laetantius.

The writings of Aristides, Quadratus, Melito, Apollinaris, and Miltiades have been lost.

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 18. *The Church: Clergy and Laity; Priests and Bishops.*

In order that the Church might fulfil her mission she needed ordinances and a constitution; and these were given to her, at least in outline, by Jesus Christ himself.

This Church constitution, founded by Christ, never underwent any essential change, though, as time went on, it was more fully developed. Already, in the days of the apostles, the Church presents itself to us as the same well-regulated, well-organized society which we find it in subsequent centuries.

This is evident from the comparisons which Christ and the apostles use in designating the Church as the “kingdom of heaven,” the “holy city,” “house of God,” “body of Christ,” whose members

the faithful are, — which can only be understood of a well-ordered society.¹

This becomes still more evident in the union of the individual communities into one large body in their relation to the apostles and to each other, which found expression in their epistles, in their mutual visits to each other, and in the offerings they made for each other's support.

Lastly, the exclusion of heretics and of those who resisted ecclesiastical authority from the Church, as well as the extension of the persecuting edicts to all Christians, presupposes that all the Christian communities were united in one and the same faith, and that they formed but one great visible body.

There was, however, no perfect equality among the Christians; on the contrary, a distinction existed between the clergy and the laity.

Even as Christ had chosen twelve apostles among the faithful (John xv. 16: *Non vos me elegistis, sed ego elegi vos*), to whom he delegated a certain power with the commission to continue his work, in like manner the apostles selected men, who were separated from the other Christians by ORDINATION, that these ordained by them might assist them in the performance of their office as proclaimers of the Word of God, dispensers of his grace, and pastors of his flock (Acts xiii. 2; Ep. ad Tim. et Tit.).

The history of the Church in the first centuries confirms this, and asserts that the distinction between clergy and laity is essential to her constitution.² The immediate disciples of the apostles and the most ancient Fathers affirm it. Tertullian even blames the heretics of his day for doing away with it.³

The weight of these testimonies is in no way invalidated by the designation “a royal priesthood,” being applied to Christians in general; as in a certain sense they may be called priests, being called upon to offer to God the sacrifice of prayer, penance, with alms and thanksgiving. The passages in which these terms occur

¹ *Regnum coelorum* : Matt. v. 3, xi. 12, etc. *Civitas sancta, Civitas Dei* : Apoc. xi. 2, xxi. 2, iii. 12. *Domus Dei* : Heb. x. 21; 1 Tim. iii. 15. *Domus Christi* : Heb. iii. 6. *Templum sanctum*. Eph. ii. 21. *Corpus Christi* : cf. 1 Cor. xii. 12; Eph. iv. 11 sqq.; Col. ii. 19.

² *Clem. Rom.* 1 Ep. ad Cor. c. 40-43.

³ *Tert. De praescr. haeret.* c. 41. *Ordinationes eorum (scl. haereticorum) temerariae leves et inconstantes; nunc neophytes conlocant, nunc saeculo obstrictos, nunc apostatas nostros . . . itaque alius hodie episcopus eras alius, hodie diaconus qui eras lector, hodie presbyter qui eras laicus: nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.*

are chiefly found in the Old Testament, and by no means exclude a separate priesthood armed with a special power in order to exercise a special office. Nor can a passage of Tertullian beginning "Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus?" be understood as intended to oppose this doctrine, as the author is not then alluding to the distinction of which he expressly treats in other places.

There was, moreover, no absolute equality among the body of the clergy themselves. Obviously there was a gradation, especially that of bishops and priests, to distinguish their respective dignity and authority.

This is clearly shown by St. Paul's epistles, particularly in his pastoral briefs (1 Tim. v. 19; Tit. i. 5; Phil. iv. 3; Col. iv. 17); also it is declared with peculiar vigor and clearness of expression in the Apocalypse of St. John (3 John 9, 10; Apoc. ii. 1). The most ancient Fathers confirm this assertion. St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, and St. Cyprian of Carthage, are clear and explicit in the testimony they render to it. In the controversies with heretics, Christian writers appealed to the unbroken succession of the bishops, shown by the catalogues of bishops who had presided over the principal churches¹ since the days of the apostles, although there were numerous presbyters in the various cities.

This distinction became still more apparent to the outer world as Christianity spread more widely and heresy began to appear; the great increase in the number of Christians often made it necessary for the bishops to add to the number of their assistants by the ordination of priests or presbyters, and the episcopal authority was often called into action for the repression of heresy, by a power acknowledged to be superior. For neither the Christians, who jealously adhered to tradition, nor the heretics themselves, ever directly denied or contested the divine institution and superiority of the episcopate. The Gnostics and other sects have even endeavored to prove episcopal succession in their own community. Even the opponents of the episcopate must admit that this institute existed in the Church as early as the second century.

Those who deny the distinction between the episcopal dignity and that of the presbytery rely principally on the indiscriminate use of the words *επίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* as we find them in Scripture

¹ *Tert.* De praeser. haeret. c. 32. Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis, vel apostolicis viris: qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem.

(Acts xx. 17 sqq.; Phil. i. 1), and in the writings of some Fathers, particularly of St. Irenæus. But, even granting this indiscriminate use of the words, it by no means follows that there is no difference of rank implied. St. Cyprian, though often calling himself a presbyter, urges the above-named distinction.

This inference can in fact so much the less be drawn, in that the Holy Scriptures did not use any determinate or permanent name to signify the clerical office, since neither the word *επίσκοπος* nor *πρεσβύτερος* expresses an ecclesiastical dignity. This meaning was gradually affixed to the words as time wore on.

Besides, this argument would prove too much for the apostles called themselves presbyters (1 Pet. v. 1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1-5) and deacons (1 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6), while others bestowed even on women the name of apostle (Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Phil. ii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 23), and describe bishops, alike with priests, as deacons (Col. iv. 7; 1 Thess. iii. 2).

St. Irenæus, to whom some appeal, clearly distinguishes between the two dignities, although in some places he attributes the word *πρεσβύτερος* to bishops.

There is a passage in St. Jerome, which is often cited to prove the equality of bishops and presbyters, in which St. Jerome seems to reduce the episcopacy to a president's office over the other priests of a church; but, apart from the fact that such an hypothesis is nowhere sustained by other writers of antiquity, this same author elsewhere acknowledges the authority of the bishops over the priests,¹ and affirms their superiority to be of divine institution² and to be definitively attributable to the apostolic age.³

When, then, St. Jerome speaks of the like powers exercised by priests and bishops, he by no means intends to lower the dignity of the bishops, rather is it his wish to protect the priest in his minis-

¹ Ep. 146 (ad Evangelum): Quid facit episcopus, *excepta ordinatione*, quod presbyter non facit? Ep. 52 (ad Nepotian.): Esto subiectus pontifici tuo et quasi animae parentem suscipe. Ep. 105 (ad Aug.): Vale, mi amice charissime, aetate fili, *dignitate* parens.

² Ep. 146 (ad Evangelum): Et ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas sumptas de veteri testamento, quod Aaron et filii ejus atque levitae in templo fuerunt, hoc episcopi, et presbyteri et diaconi sibi vindicent in ecclesia.

³ Quod et fecerunt apostoli per singulas provincias ordinantes presbyteros et episcopos. Ep. 41 (ad Marcellam): Apud nos apostolorum locum episcopi tenent. St. Jerome (De vir. ill.) also calls St. Ignatius the third bishop after St. Peter at Antioch. He also says that the Apostle St. James had been nominated by the other apostles Bishop of Jerusalem, and St. Polyearp Bishop of Smyrna by the Apostle St. John.

terial office; yet it must be admitted that in this instance he was influenced by feelings of momentary excitement and bitterness.

Lastly, it may be remarked, against the acceptation of the theory that St. Jerome taught the complete equality of the episcopal and priestly dignity, that neither St. Augustine nor any other bishop ever blamed him on this head, whereas Aërius, who proclaimed this equality, was excommunicated.

§ 19. Election and Functions of the Bishops.—Other Ecclesiastical Offices.—Education and Support of the Clergy.

According to the statement in the Acts of the Apostles and of St. Clement of Rome,¹ the apostles themselves appointed the first bishops; later on, the faithful of the laity were admitted to take part in the election of their clergy. After the death of a bishop, the bishops of the province and those of the vicinity assembled in the bereaved episcopal city, and there a new bishop was elected, through the suffrages of the clergy of the episcopal city, with the concurrence of the assistant bishops and the consent of the people. The consecration by two or three provincial bishops then took place.²

Each diocese had but one bishop, whose authority extended to every congregation included within it. Besides the functions now common to the presbyterate, the bishop possessed the exclusive right of receiving catechumens, and of excommunicating unworthy members, as also, in general, the right of exercising the principal authority alike over clergy and laity.

Other ecclesiastical appointments in his own diocese were in the hands of the bishop, who, however, on momentous occasions took counsel of the clergy and the people, yet without being bound by their consent.³

Next to the bishop stood the presbyters, who had power to preach, to celebrate Mass, and to administer the sacraments, subject, however, to the bishop;⁴ and they could not administer the sacrament of ordination.

The third order of the ecclesiastical hierarchy was that of deacons, who assisted the bishop during Mass, distributed holy communion,⁵

¹ *Clem. Rom.* Ad Cor. 1, 44.

² *Cyprian.* Ep. 68.

³ *Ibid.* Ep. 27 and 33.

⁴ *Ignatius,* Ep. ad Smyrna, c. 8. *Tert.* De bapt. c. 17.

⁵ *Just.* Apol. i. 65. *Cyp.* De lapsis. Solemnibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre praesentibus coepit.

and baptized; the administration of church property and the distribution of alms were also intrusted to them. At an early period it became necessary to check any abuse of this power, by strict laws enacted at the synods.

In the East, not before the middle of the fourth century, subdeacons¹ were appointed, chiefly to assist the deacons. For the increasing wants of the Church the lower orders² of acolyte, lector, exorcist, and janitor were added.

To assist the female catechumens at baptism, deaconesses were appointed; these also devoted themselves to the care of the sick.

A special class of ecclesiastical dignitaries were the so-called chor-bishops, or rural bishops, some of whom had received episcopal consecration, but the majority of whom remained simply priests.

Those of the faithful who lived in the country were at first attended to by the clergy of the neighboring cities, but after a while they obtained pastors in their own rural villages.

In the early ages of the Church the clergy were practically trained to their office under the eye of the bishop. Soon, however, schools began to be formed in various places for the education of the clergy; among these may be enumerated those at Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Cæsarea, etc.

The clergy who possessed no property of their own lived partly by the labor of their own hands, partly by the contributions and offerings of the faithful (Acts xx. 34; Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 12).

§ 20. *The Authority of the Metropolitan. — Synods.*

The metropolitan power, without being of divine institution, is not a work of supererogation; it is an outcome of the primacy of the Pope, whose place the metropolitan takes in a special province as the centre of unity for that province, in the same manner as the Pope is the centre of unity for the whole Church.³

As to how the metropolitan union arose, it may be explained thus: The church from which the faith was carried into other places was usually, though not always, in the capital city, or the metropolis.

¹ Hypodiaconi, *ὑπηδάκοντες*. Ep. *Corn.* Rom. ad Fabium Ant. ap. *Eus.* vi. 43. *Cyp.* Ep. 24 ad clerum Carth. : Fecisse me autem sciatis *lectorem* Saturnum et *hypodiaconum* Optatum confessorem.

² These were all enumerated in a letter from Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Ant. ap. *Eus.* vi. 43.

³ *Leo M.* Ep. 14, c. 11.

When churches arose in these other places, they looked back to the city church as to the mother church, and the bishops and priests of the last-formed churches remained in a certain degree of dependence on the one from which they had received the faith.¹ And as the apostles exercised their mission, in the first place, in the large cities, whence the faith spread far and wide, the political capital on account of its *religious importance* came also to be considered the ecclesiastical capital.

The first example of a metropolitan church is that of the mother church of Jerusalem, to which the episcopal churches of Palestine were united. Her metropolitan dignity afterwards passed to the See of Caesarea Stratonis. The three most important metropolitan sees were those of Antioch, of Alexandria, and, above all, of Rome. The sees of Ephesus and Carthage were also considered as metropolitan sees.

The unity and organic relation of single churches to this metropolitan authority is also seen in the synods, which are not imitations of the Amphictyonis or other assemblies of Greece, but are radically of apostolic origin.

The most ancient synods of which we have any account are the council of the apostles at Jerusalem, the synods held against the Montanists (about 160), and those held in order to decide the time for celebrating the Paschal festival and the matter of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics.

In many provinces synods were regularly held every year; in others, only when some special exigence made it advisable. The proper and necessary members of synods were bishops only; presbyters and deacons were, however, admitted to give their opinion; even laymen were not absolutely excluded.

§ 21. *The Primacy.*

The supreme power² which Christ had bestowed on St. Peter was essential, nay, indispensable, for the foundation and preservation³ of

¹ *Heg. ap. Eus.* iii. 32.

² *Ballerini*, *De vi ac ratione primatus*. Veron. 1776, Monast. 1845. *Schrader*, *De unitate Romana*. Frib. 1862. *Kenrick* (Archbishop of Baltimore), *The Primacy of the Apostolic See*. 3 vols. *Bellarmin*, *Praef. in libros de summo Pontifice*, n. 2: *De qua re agitur, cum de primatu Pontificis agitur?* *Brevissime dicam: De summa rei Christianae. The Chair of St. Peter*, by *Count Murphy*.

³ *Cyp.* *De unit. eccl. c. 4.* Ep. 70: *Una ecclesia a Christo Domino super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata.* Cf. Ep. 73.

ecclesiastical unity. It could not therefore be dissolved by the death of St. Peter, unless the One Church built upon that impregnable rock was to be torn up and divided into a number of different factions.¹ The very existence of the Church as one organic body required that the centralization of power should pass in all its fulness from St. Peter to his lawful successors,² the bishops of Rome. These, in virtue of divine appointment, received with the episcopal power also his supreme power over the whole Church. Consequently the Bishop of Rome has ever been acknowledged as the head of the whole Church.

Christian antiquity was so fully persuaded of this truth that that alone explains the peculiar attitude which both the orthodox and heretical believer assumed towards the Roman Church.

Even the prerogatives which St. Ignatius of Antioch ascribes to this Church bear a beautiful witness to its pre-eminence: he calls her *προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης*, the leader in the bond of love, that is, the Universal Church,³ and intrusts to her care his own church, which was at that time deprived of its pastor.⁴

St. Irenæus clearly affirms the primacy of the Roman Church in the words: "Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem (al. potentiorum) principalitatem [on account of its more powerful authority] necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam." "When, therefore," he adds, "you have learned the faith of this Church, you know that of the others also."⁵

¹ *Hieron.* C. Luciferianos, no. 9: Ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors quaedam et ab omnibus eminens datur potestas, tot in ecclesia efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes.

² See the pastoral letter of Pope Clement on page 78.

³ Ep. ad Rom.

⁴ I. e. e. 9. *Μόνος αὐτὴν* (the church of Antioch) *Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐπισκοπήσει,* καὶ ἡ ὑμῶν ἀγάπη.

⁵ *Iren.* Adv. haer. iii. 3, 1, 2. Traditionem itaque apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni ecclesia adest respicere omnibus, qui vera velint videre: et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. . . . Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, *maximae et antiquissimae, et omnibus cognitae*, a glorioissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae, eam, quam habet ab apostolis traditionem, et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones, episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoque modo, vel per sibi placentia, vel vanam gloriam, vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam, practerquam oportet colligunt. *Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem (al. potentiorum) principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam.* *hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quae est ab apostolis traditio.*

St. Cyprian expresses the same idea when he calls the Roman Church the seat of Peter ("cathedra Petri"), the root and source of the Church, "the principal Church, whence sacerdotal unity is derived, . . . to which infidelity has no access." To be united with the See of Rome is to be in communion with the Catholic Church.¹

The writings of Tertullian² himself bear important witness to the supremacy of the Roman bishops. Even as a Montanist he gives expression to the general conviction of his time, when he ironically styles Pope Zephyrinus "Supreme Pontifex, Bishop of bishops."

The actions of the most ancient Fathers, no less than their words, express their views regarding the authority of the bishops of Rome, who were recognized as supreme judges, on whose decision the bishops of the whole world depended.

St. Dionysius of Alexandria unhesitatingly defended his orthodoxy³ before Pope Dionysius of Rome, when he had been accused of heterodoxy. St. Cyprian defended the validity of his election before Pope Cornelius, and earnestly besought Pope Stephen to depose Martianus, Bishop of Arles, who was infected with the Novatian heresy,⁴ and to appoint another in his stead. In like manner, bishops such as Basilides in Spain and Privatus in Africa, who had been deposed in a provincial synod, sought the favor of Rome to be reinstated in their office.⁵

The Roman bishops themselves were ever fully conscious of their supreme authority, and acted accordingly. St. Clement, the second successor of St. Peter, exercised this authority, while St. John was yet living, for the purpose of quelling some discord that had broken out at Corinth, which was not under his immediate jurisdiction.

¹ Ep. 55, ad Cornel. : Post illa adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab haereticis constituto, navigare audent et ad *Petri cathedram* atque ad *ecclesiam principalem* (cf. *Iren.* iii. 3, 2), unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre nec cogitare eos esse Romanos, quorum fides apostolo praedicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. — Radix et matrix ecclesiae (Ep. 45). Ep. 56 ad Antonian. (a converted Novatian bishop) : Ut sciret (scl. Pope Cornelius) te secum, id est eum ecclesia catholica communicare. Ep. 45 ad Cornelium : Placuit, ut per episcopos . . . litterae fierent, sicuti fiunt, ut te universi collegae nostri et communicationem tuam, id est, catholicae ecclesiae unitatem pariter et caritatem probarent firmiter ac teneriter.

² De praescr. haeret. c. 36. Scorpiae adv. Gnosticos, c. 10. Memento claves ejus (scl. coeli) hic Dominum Petro et per eum ecclesiae reliquisse.

³ See § 29.

⁴ Ep. 55 ; Ep. 67.

⁵ Cyp. Ep. 68. Romam pergens (scl. Basilides) Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum, et gestae rei ac veritatis ignarum febellit, ut exambiret repomini se injuste in episcopatum, de quo fuerat juste depositus.

Pope Victor decided the question as to the time of observing Easter;¹ Pope Stephen, that concerning the validity of baptism conferred by heretics.²

An acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Popes lies in the very fact of sending to Rome all synodical decrees, as in the Novatian schism and in the disputes on baptism conferred by heretics. This is in itself an expression of the right of the bishop presiding there to approve or reject these synodical decrees.

Heretics themselves bear witness to the primacy of the Roman Bishop; for they sought to win his countenance for their errors, and applied to him to be restored to the Church when their own bishops had excommunicated them.

Lastly, it appears, according to St. Cyprian,³ that the pre-eminence of the Bishop of Rome was known to the Emperor Decius; also, according to Eusebius,⁴ to the Emperor Aurelian.

Efforts have not, it is true, been wanting to try to prove that the primacy of the Roman bishop is a usurpation of a later date; but the enemies of the Papacy have not yet succeeded in stating *when* and *where* the bishops usurped their power, nor can they adduce any argument to overthrow the testimony we have cited from antiquity.

The principal arguments brought against the primacy are, a letter of St. Irenaeus to Pope Victor regarding the time of keeping Easter; and the writings and conduct of the two bishops, Cyprian of Carthage and Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who defended their views on baptism conferred by heretics against Pope Stephen.

But the holy bishop of Lyons only says in his letter, that the question concerning the time of celebrating Easter scarcely appears to be of sufficient importance to justify the excommunicating those persons who were not willing to accept the Roman practice, pleading that for this reason Victor's predecessors had not done so. In no way, however, does the saint contest the right of the Pope to do this; on the contrary, his letter shows that he takes it for granted.

Neither do the names *frater*, *collega*, applied by St. Cyprian to the Roman Bishop, by any means imply a denial of superior rank on the part of the latter, any more than his writing⁵ addressed to the Spanish bishops in regard to the two Libellatic bishops deposed by them. For Cyprian only upholds the deposition as rightful on these grounds: (1) Because they had been lawfully deposed; (2) Because the appeal of Basilides to Pope Stephen had lost its force from the matter being

¹ § 37.

² § 33.

³ Ep. 52.

⁴ H. E. vii. 30.

⁵ Ep. 68.

incorrectly stated, so that Stephen could not form a righteous judgment; (3) His predecessor, Pope Cornelius, had himself commanded that a criminal bishop should be deposed.¹

In these grounds brought forward by Cyprian, we find no testimony against the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. His letter indeed furnishes, on the contrary, important proofs of this same; for we find in the letter (1) An appeal to the Pope from a provincial synod; (2) A recognition of the same by the Spanish bishops, who had thereby fallen into difficulties in which they had had recourse to Cyprian. The third indeed blames Basilides for making the appeal, but not Pope Stephen for listening to it.

Nor do the severe expressions which in some writings² Cyprian and Firmilian made use of in regard to the Pope, warrant the conclusion that they did not recognize his primacy; for (1) Blaming a Pope does not necessarily involve a denial of his supremacy; (2) Both bishops make a direct allusion to his primacy, in order to point out to Stephen that (*a*) he was not imitating the example of Peter, who, although the first among the apostles, did not plume himself on his primacy, but was ready to take advice;³ and (*b*) that he was destroying the unity of the Church which was founded on the primacy by recognizing the validity of baptism by heretics.⁴

Chronological Record of the Popes in this Period.

Among the bishops, those of Rome ranked as the first and most eminent, they being generally acknowledged as the successors of St. Peter, and consequently as being endowed with the primacy bestowed by Christ upon the prince of the apostles. It is true that in the first centuries all the consequences resulting from the idea of primacy were not developed; they were to manifest themselves more clearly as time wore on. The Popes themselves hesitated to act on such conclusions without some necessity arising to call them

¹ Ep. 68: Maxime cum jampridem nobiscum, et cum omnibus omnino episcopis in toto mundo constitutis etiam Cornelius collega noster, sacerdos pacificus ac justus, et martyrio quoque dignatione Domini honoratus, decreverit ejusmodi homines, ad poenitentiam quidem agendam posse admitti, ab ordinatione autem cleri atque sacerdotali honore prohiberi.

² Ep. Cyp. 70-76.

³ Ep. 71: Nam nec Petrus, quem *primum* Dominus elegit, et super quem aedificavit ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere, et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi potius oportere.

⁴ Ep. 75. Cf. Ep. 70, 71, 74.

forth; and in a well-constituted society, such as the Church was from the beginning, the fidelity with which the individual chiefs discharged their functions under the influence of the extraordinary gifts of grace with which they were filled, gave the supreme head but little occasion to exercise such authority in a specific manner. The Popes contented themselves rather with a mediate supervision over other individual churches, besides the immediate rule with which they governed their own particular province; and this the more as even thus they could only labor under constant danger of their lives. The idea, however, was always the same; the Church had at all times, in the Roman primacy, a strong connecting bond, a guiding star emitting its rays into all parts of Christendom. Little as has been transmitted to us regarding the bishops of Rome in the first three centuries, that little suffices to show their position and influence in the Church.

The immediate successor to St. Peter was St. Linus,¹ who occupied this seat between twelve and thirteen years, and was succeeded by Cletus, or Anacletus. Clement, a Pope highly renowned in the ancient Church, who is celebrated in numerous legends and is also venerated as a martyr, issued, even during the lifetime of St. John, to the Church of Corinth a pastoral letter² which was long read in most of the churches. In this he expressly and strongly censured some disturbances that had occurred, demanded obedience as one speaking in the name of Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, and emphasized the continuation of the kingdom of God of the old covenant in the Church of Christ and her solidly membered order, as he had received the doctrine from the apostles, with whom he had stood in intimate relation.

Clement was succeeded by Evaristus, Alexander I., Xystus (Sixtus I.); then by Telesphorus, whose glorious martyrdom is depicted by Irenaeus; by Hyginus, Pius I., Anicetus (+ 168), under whom the Jewish convert Hegesippus and Bishop Polycarp were in Rome. Then also came, in succession, Soter, whose letter to the Church of Corinth was, like that of Clement, publicly read in the Church. Denys, Bishop of Corinth, eulogizes the liberality of this Pope in aiding poorer communities, as exceeding even the wonted munificence of the Roman Church. Thus the great Church of the Romans, whose faith St. Paul had praised as "spoken of in the whole world" (Rom. i. 8), proved herself also to be the

¹ Probably mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 21.

² Chapters lviii.-lxiv. were found in the year 1876.

presiding mistress of charity, that is to say, the Christian bond of love.

Eleutherios (or Eleutherius), previously Deacon of Anicetus (Hegesippus), was the twelfth occupant of the Roman chair (successor of St. Peter). To him the martyrs of the Church of Lyons sent Irenaeus (at that time their priest), with a detailed account of the persecution at that place, and commanding him warmly to the Pope. It was during this pontificate that Irenaeus wrote his five books in refutation of the Gnostics, in which he brings forward that powerful testimony to the authority of the Church which we have already given.¹

After the second century the sources respecting that authority become more numerous. Victor I. (190–202), an Africian, labored to establish uniformity in the celebration of the paschal feast.² His successor, Zephyrinus (202–218), defended the tradition of the Roman Church in points of doctrine and discipline.³ The charges brought against him of ignorance and avarice are merely the assertions of a fanatical opponent, who also uttered similar calumnies against his distinguished counsellor, afterwards his successor, Callistus I. (218–223). Callistus was, without the slightest opposition, elected bishop by the Roman clergy, and recognized as such by the whole body of the Church. Respecting his contest with Hippolytus, see § 24. Callistus declared the marriages between the daughters of the free and noble born and men who were slaves or poor freemen to be perfectly valid; and this in despite of the temporal laws then existing. He was moderate in the penitential discipline he sought to enforce; and respecting the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity he kept free alike from Sabellian-Modalism and from Dualism.

The succeeding Popes, like most of their predecessors, were martyrs: Urban I. (223–230), Pontianus⁴ (+ 235), and Fabian (236–250), who published a letter against a criminal bishop, and was put to death under Decius. After a vacancy of eighteen months, Cornelius (+ 252) was unanimously elected, notwithstanding the imperial prohibition.⁵ Lucius I., his successor, died the death of a martyr (252). Stephen I. (254–257), who had previously been a Roman priest, proved, according to Dionysius of Alexandria, faithful to the ancient repute of his chair; he was solicitous for the spiritual and temporal needs of even the remotest churches, and held fast to

¹ See above.

² See § 37.

³ §§ 24, 35.

⁴ See § 24.

⁵ *Cyp.* Ep. 55. See § 35.

tradition.¹ He died the death of a martyr, as did also his successor Xystus II. (Sixtus), Aug. 6, 258. The Roman chair then remained vacant until July 21, 259.

St. Dionysius (259–269), who had been a priest and was a special friend of the Bishop of Alexandria of the same name, was greatly renowned.² He consoled by letter the Christians in Cappadocia, who were suffering severely from the invasions of barbarians, and commissioned his legates to redeem the captives. A century later, St. Basil attests that the Popes by their letters had always comforted and consoled the Orientals when in affliction, and that the above-named letter of Dionysius was preserved by them with great veneration. It was everywhere known that the central point of Christian unity was to be sought for in Italy and Rome.³ Felix (269–274) sent a letter to a synod in Antioch, in which he dwelt with prominent emphasis on the perfect divinity and humanity of Christ; a part of this letter was afterwards taken up to form a portion of the acts of the Third Ecumenical Council. Of the successors of Felix Eutychianus and Cajus, nothing reliable is known except their names.

Marcellinus (296–304) died a martyr in the Diocletian persecution. That he had ever sacrificed to the idols, is a lie, invented at a later date by the schismatic Donatists; it was immediately denounced as such. Under the successors of Marcellinus, the previous questions respecting the fallen (*lapsi*) came up again. One named Heraclius, who had himself at a former time apostatized, now denied penance to the fallen. On this a violent controversy broke out. Maxentius therefore exiled Marcellus (307–309) and his successor Eusebius, who died in exile in Sicily in 310 or 311. As he exiled Heraclius, also, he seems to have had in view only the preservation of the public peace.

Melchiades, or Miltiades (310 or 311–314), who had already sent deacons with letters from the emperor and the praetorian prefect to the city prefects, to effect the restoration of the property confiscated during the time of the persecution, held, on Oct. 2, 313, a synod with eleven bishops. He was the first of the Popes who dwelt in the Lateran, and the last that was entombed in the Catacombs.

Christian Rome, undermining Pagan Rome, now came publicly to the front. Magnificent basilicas were henceforth built; and the Church found in Sylvester I. a head renowned alike in history as in legend, and one who was called upon to inaugurate a new era.

¹ See §§ 21, 33.

² See § 29.

³ See above.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. THE FATHERS AND WRITERS OF THE CHURCH.¹§ 22. *The Apostolic Fathers.*

If the manner in which Christianity spread and verified its doctrines, and the zeal with which the early Christians laid hold of the truths of faith, gave no special occasion to the editing of learned works on this subject, yet the writings of some disciples of the first century have come down to us, and are the more valuable on account of their authors having received the faith immediately from the apostles themselves.

To these Apostolic Fathers,² who wrote in Greek and mostly in the form of letters, belongs St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, of whose life we have but scanty reports. We possess his epistle to the Corinthians, and two writings addressed to virgins or ascetics of either sex. The second letter to the Corinthians is of dubious authenticity. The so-called "Recognitiones Clementis," and the "Clementina," or twenty Clementine homilies, are obviously spurious.

A "Catholic Epistle" ascribed to Barnabas is yet extant, but its authenticity is disputed.

Of great importance as regards the knowledge of Christian antiquity are the epistles which St. Ignatius wrote to his friend Polycarp and to several churches when he was on the way from Antioch to Rome (105-107).³ We possess them in two forms, — one short,

¹ There is a distinction to be made between the ecclesiastical Fathers and writers (patres et scriptores ecclesiastici). To the former belong (*a*) antiquitas; (*b*) doctrina orthodoxa; (*c*) insignis sanctitas; and (*d*) approbatio (expressa aut tacita) ecclesiae. The latter are such writers as lack one or other of these marks. Those Fathers and saintly teachers of later times who combined purity of faith with a doctrina eminens, were called Doctors of the Church. Among the Orientals, such were Sts. Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Chrysostom; among the Western doctors were Sts. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Hilary (since 1851), Alphonsus of Ligouri (since 1871); and since 1877, also St. Francis de Sales. On the authority of the Fathers of the Church, compare *Fessler*, Inst. patrol. i. 8 sqq.

² *Freppel*, Les pères apostoliques. Paris, 1859. Their writings are completely edited by *Cotelerius*, 2 vols., Paris, 1672, augmented by *Joh. Clericus*, Antwerp, 1692, and Amstel, 1724. *Gallandi*, Biblioth. patrum, vol. i. *Migne*, Patrol. graec., vol. i. H. Ante-Nicene Library of the Fathers, London.

³ From Smyrna he wrote the letters to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, and to the Romans; from Troas he wrote to the Philadelphians, to the Christians of Smyrna, and to St. Polyearp.

which is genuine ; the other interpolated, of longer form. He principally defends the divinity and true incarnation of Christ.

St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who, like St. Ignatius, was a disciple of St. John, wrote a letter to the Philippians.

An interesting description of early Christian life is contained in the letter addressed to Diognet, a pagan, by an unknown disciple of the apostles.

Highly valued, also, was the work "Pastor" of Hermas, whom some identify with the Hermas mentioned in Rom. xvi. 14, whereas others take him to be a brother of Pope Pius I. (140-152). The book is divided into three parts,¹ and contains various instructions, exhortations, and precepts.

Lastly, Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, is to be numbered with the Apostolic Fathers. Unfortunately, but a few fragments of his work "Expositions of our Lord's Discourses," in which he collects the oral traditions concerning the discourses and deeds of Christ, have come down to us.

The Acts of the Martyrdom of St. Ignatius and of St. Polycarp are precious relics of Christian antiquity. The authenticity of the works ascribed to St. Denys the Areopagite is justly called in question.

The so-called Apostolic Canons (85) and the Apostolic Constitutions date from the second, third, and fourth centuries.

The encyclical letter of the Church at Smyrna on the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, comprising twenty-two chapters, was composed by a certain Evarestus, and almost entirely received by Eusebius into his Church History (vi. 15). It was addressed to "all communities of the Holy Catholic Church of all places," as the community at Smyrna was convinced that all Christendom, united in Christ, its invisible Head, would sincerely participate in the fate of the heroic bishop Polycarp, who had fallen a victim to cruel persecution.

This letter, in which the constancy and glorious martyrdom of the holy Bishop of Smyrna is described, contains also several characteristic points on doctrine. It blames those that impetuously demand the crown of martyrdom : "Brethren, we do not praise those who offer themselves, since such is also against the teaching of the gospel." The days on which the martyrs have died are designated as the days of their birth, that is, their birth for heaven. A clear distinction is made between the adoration of Christ and the veneration of martyrs. The divinity of Christ and the Trinity of God are testified in the last prayer of St. Polycarp.

¹ Visiones (4) ; Mandata (12) ; Similitudines (10).

§ 23. *The Christian Writers of the Second Century.*

The second century produced a great number of literary works, letters, dialogues, treatises, of which unfortunately a great part has been lost. The principal object of these writings had direct reference to the exigencies of the Church at that time, and therefore they were chiefly apologetic and polemic.

The most ancient writer of this century, whose works we still possess, at least in part, is St. Justin, the philosopher and martyr. He was born at Flavia Neapolis (Sichem), in Samaria. After having vainly sought for interior peace in the different systems of pagan philosophy, Justin found at last in the Church the truth he so ardently desired. It was in defence of Christianity that he addressed his powerful *Apology* to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. Besides this he wrote a second to Marcus Aurelian, and a "Dialogue with the Jew Trypho," in which he refutes the Jewish objections against Christianity and defends its divine origin. During the latter part of his life Justin founded a philosophical school in Rome. He was martyred (167). The genuineness of the "Cohortatio" and of the "Oratio ad Graecos," also of the work "De monarchia," has been disputed. Many other works also ascribed to him are spurious. The style of Justin is simple and easily understood, which makes his writings all the more valuable, as they thoroughly develop and prove the truth of Christianity. Knowledge of the truth as it is found in paganism is, according to him, the effect of the *λόγος σπερματικός* the fructifying word that enlightened even the pagan philosophers. The views respecting the origin of demons and the Chiliastic imaginations are the same as those of the other Fathers.

St. Justin acknowledged the good element in pagan, and particularly in Platonic, philosophy, while his disciple Tatian, who at a later day fell into Gnosticism, and founded the sect of the so-called Enkratites, severely criticised the morals, laws, religion, and philosophy of the pagans, without doing much in defence of the Church. He wrote an "Oratio contra Graecos."

Far superior to this "Oratio" is the "Legatio pro Christianis" addressed by the philosopher Athenagoras to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus. The same author wrote a treatise, "De resurrectione mortuorum."

Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, wrote several exegetical and polemical works; but the three books which he addressed to the pagan

Autolyceus are all that remain. This work is written in a clear and lucid style; the author demonstrates the great absurdity of the whole pagan worship. He then explains, and with great sagacity proves the truth of, the Christian doctrine. He uses the expression *τριάς* to designate the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, which he illustrates in a speculative way in his second book.

The "Irresio gentilium philosophorum" of Hermias is of little importance.

To the best literary productions of this epoch belong the works of St. Irenæus. He was born in Asia Minor, and instructed by St. Polycarp. He became Bishop of Lyons in 178, and suffered martyrdom in 202. He had a thorough knowledge of all philosophical systems and of the Holy Scriptures, as we see in his five books "Adversus haereses." Of this work we possess an ancient literal Latin translation and some fragments of the original Greek text. There are also some letters to Pope Victor and to the heretics Florinus and Blastus, still extant in a fragmentary form. The works of St. Irenæus are of special importance in regard to the doctrines of tradition, of the authority of the Church and of the Primacy. He entertains the Chiliastic views; as did Papias, whose writings he had studied.

§ 24. *The Christian Writers of the Third Century.*

A still greater literary activity was displayed by the Christian scholars of the third century. Their works range through the entire field of theology, although the circumstances of the times even yet required a predominance of polemical works.

The attempts to resuscitate paganism called forth a vigorous and unsparing effort on the part of the Fathers to show the utter absurdity of the worship of the heathen gods; while the rationalistic heresies demanded a strong, searching, and conclusive defence of the fundamental doctrines of the Church. Various ecclesiastical dissensions created the necessity of more clearly determining the constitution of the Church and of the hierarchy, while the contentions respecting discipline required a more thorough investigation of the points in question.

Most writers of this century published, in addition to their polemical works, popular treatises on moral, ascetic, and historical subjects, which are of no less importance than the former. Some learned men even attempted to reduce to a speculative system the articles

of faith, in order to distinguish the true Christian Gnosis from the false one. These attempts, however, did not always succeed in keeping clear from scientific error.

The works at this time, as formerly, were mostly written as dialogues and treatises. We also possess many interesting letters and some poems belonging to this epoch. Most of these are written in Greek, as few authors of this date availed themselves of the Latin language.

Lastly, it is deserving of a special mention that many learned schools were founded in the third century, by means of which Christian youth could receive a scientific education without being compelled to frequent pagan institutions. One of the most celebrated of these Christian schools was the Alexandrian Catechetical School, the first superior of which is said to have been Pantænus (180). He was a convert from the Stoics, and was appointed head of the Catechetical School by Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria. Under his direction the school soon flourished. Pantænus had an extensive knowledge of Scripture and of philosophy. But few fragments of his works have come down to us.

When Pantænus had relinquished his office in Alexandria in order to go and preach the gospel in India, he was succeeded in the government of India by his pupil Titus Flavius Clement, probably of Athens (about 186). The latter had received a thorough scientific education, and was acquainted with all the various systems of philosophy; but the thirst for truth which filled his great mind first received full satisfaction in Christianity. Clement devoted himself with zeal and earnestness to the instruction of youth, until the persecution under Septimius Severus (202) compelled him to leave Alexandria. He first betook himself to Flaviades, in Cappadocia, and thence to Jerusalem, where he opened a new school. We have no certain record of his last days (+ before 220).

Of the authentic works of this distinguished teacher, we have only the "Cohortatio ad gentes," the "Pædagogus," the "Stromata," and the little essay, "Quis dives salvetur," remaining to us. The most significant of these are the "Stromata," in which all the most important religious and philosophical theories of that day are discussed in many points of view. Clement laid great stress upon philosophy; but far from confounding it with faith, he assigns it only the place of a servant to the higher teaching. He did not attach himself to any one particular philosophical system; rather was he eclectic as a philosopher. His demonstrations are for the

most part high-flown and figurative; perhaps at times they are even intentionally obscure, while the contents of his works are of a very varied character. Unfortunately they are not altogether free from error, which prevents their author being numbered with the saints and Fathers of the Church.

Far more celebrated than Clement is Origen, the genial disciple of the former (born about 185), son of the martyr Leonidas of Alexandria. Uniting an extraordinary talent to unremitting diligence, he had already, even when quite young, attained so comprehensive a knowledge of philosophy (Ammonius Saccas) and of theology, that in the year 203 Bishop Demetrius appointed him head of the Catechetical School. His reputation for learning attracted so very many Christian and pagan pupils that he was obliged to depute his disciple, Heraclas, to assist in the elementary department.

In the beginning of the third century Origen undertook a journey to Rome to see this "oldest of all churches." At a later date (215) he went to Arabia. To escape the snares laid for him by Caracallas, he fled to Palestine, where he found safety and a welcome with his friends Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, Bishop of Cæsarea.

On his return to Alexandria, Origen was summoned to Antioch by the Empress Mammea, the mother of Alexander Severus. About the year 228 he accepted an invitation to Greece. Passing through Palestine on his way thither, he was ordained priest by the above-named bishops. This irregular ordination, and various errors which had crept into the works of this celebrated teacher, caused Demetrius to excommunicate him at two synods, and to depose him from his office. On this, Origen opened a new school in Cæsarea (Stratonis), where he was soon surrounded by a numerous auditory, among whom were Gregory Thaumaturgus and his brother Athenodorus. On the death of Demetrius he returned to Alexandria, where, however, he did not remain long, but soon went to Cappadocia, Palestine, and Greece, whence after a somewhat long sojourn he again travelled to Arabia to confute the heretic Beryllus of Bostra. It was during the reign of Philip Arabs that Origen wrote his famous *Apology* against Celsus. During the persecution by Decius he was imprisoned and sorely mishandled. Not long after regaining his freedom, the heroic confessor died at Tyre (254), probably from the effects of the torture he had undergone.

The works of this pious and ascetic man, in whom dialectic versa-

tility, extensive learning, and speculative talent are so gloriously combined, are divided into exegetical (Hexapla) dogmatic, apologetico-polemical, and practical. They contain a fulness of profound reflections presented in a classic form. Unfortunately, only a part of them have escaped destruction. These, notwithstanding some not insignificant errors, especially in the work on "First Principles," will always remain in high estimation by the Church.

Origen was succeeded in the Catechetical School by his disciples Heraclas and Dionysius the Great, both of whom subsequently became bishops of Alexandria. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus, as previously mentioned, was one of the disciples of the celebrated Alexandrian, to whose friends St. Hippolytus also belonged.

It is to the "Philosophumena" that we are indebted for what information we possess concerning the life of this last-named mysterious personage. Hippolytus, the disciple of St. Irenæus, was neither Bishop of Aden nor of Portus Romanus (Porto), but presbyter at Rome, where he was the head of a celebrated institution. He combated the Patri-passionists, but he himself fell into insubordinate errors; he was afterwards set up as anti-Pope against Callistus, his former opponent under Pope Zephyrinus. This gave occasion to the first schism, which lasted to the death of Callistus. Under Pontianus his successor Hippolytus was reconciled to the Church, and underwent banishment to Sardinia, together with the lawful Pope. They both died in exile (235). Their relics were afterwards brought to Rome.

Hippolytus also wrote against the pagans and Jews, and against Noëtus, with other works which now exist only in a fragmentary form.

The most ancient Latin writer is probably Quintus Septimius Florence Tertullian, born in the year 160, in Carthage. Having embraced Christianity (196), he was, on the death of his wife, ordained priest, and became the most eloquent apologist of the Western Church. By his love of moral severity he was attracted to Montanism; and it is doubtful whether, when he died (240), he was reconciled to the Church.

The character of this original and spiritual, if somewhat one-sided and stern, man is reflected in his writings, of which Vincent of Lerins says: "Quot pene verba, tot et sententiae." His language is often obscure and somewhat hard to understand, though his style is fluent and animated. His apologetical and polemic works are sometimes very bitter, and in expression too provoking, while the as-

cetical treatises are too rigorous ; the works which Tertullian wrote as a Montanist must, however, be distinguished from those he wrote previously.

Tertullian speaks, with great zest, of the inward consciousness of God existing in the human soul. Against heresy he brings forward the claim of the Church to the prescriptive right afforded by actual possession. Respecting the origin of the soul, he favors Traducianism. He also speaks of its corporeity, without, however, denying its essential spirituality.

Minucius Felix, who resided in Rome as administrator, wrote a charming apology for Christianity, in the form of a dialogue, in which he introduces a heathen, Cæcilius, who asserts the customary pretexts against Christianity and its followers, which he then confutes one by one, if with some degree of irony, yet on the whole with dignity and sound arguments, which finally convert his opponent. This work, according to some, was written about the year 166.

Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus, renowned for the erudition displayed in his works, is no less distinguished for his apostolic zeal and firm adherence to the Church than for his loving compassion for the needy and suffering. At first he taught rhetoric at Carthage, his native city ; then, after his conversion through the priest Cæcilius, he was himself ordained priest (245), by Bishop Donatus ; the bishop dying, Cyprian, although still a neophyte, was elected to succeed him. He exercised his office with great prudence until the Decian persecution compelled him to leave the episcopal city. The faithful pastor then guided his flock by letters, as the schism of Felicissimus was at that time disturbing the congregation. On his return to Carthage (251) he at several synods uttered decisions concerning the receiving again of the lapsed into the Church. His decision that baptism conferred by heretics is null, was condemned by Pope Stephen. He, with many others, suffered martyrdom on the 14th of September, 258, during the Valerian persecution.

The writings of this Catholic bishop and martyr are distinguished by the tranquillity of their tone, their simplicity and dignity ;¹ neither is it possible to ignore the influence exercised on Cyprian's writings by the works of Tertullian, which he had studied. Beside many letters which convey important information concerning the ecclesiastical circumstances of that era, Cyprian left several apologetico-polemical treatises and practical instructions.

Arnobius, the African rhetorician, wrote, before he was received

¹ *Laet. Inst. div. v. 1.*

into the Church, "Disputationes adversus gentes," in which he points out the absurdity and the immoral character of paganism.

Lactantius, the Christian Cicero, the influence of whose works more properly belongs to the following epoch, was the author of several not uninteresting works.

2. HERESIES AND SCHISMS.

§ 25. *Judaizing Heretics.*

More devastating than the bloody persecutions, more dangerous than the so-called learned dissertations against Christianity, were the enemies that at the same time arose within the bosom of the Church to teach false doctrine; these Tertullian justly stigmatizes as the forerunners of Antichrist.¹

The heresies of this period were chiefly of Judaistic, Gnostic, and rationalistic character.

To the first class belong the Ebionites, who held that Christ was only man, and that the Mosaic law was obligatory on all converts; also the Nazarenes, who restricted the obligation of the Jewish law to Jewish converts, and accepted the dogma that Christ was supernaturally conceived and born of the Virgin.

The Elkesaites, a kindred sect to the Ebionites and closely connected with the Essenes, were more inclined to Gnosticism. A Gnostic Ebionitism is contained in the "Clementine Homilies," falsely attributed to Pope Clement I. The author of these mingles Christian, Jewish, and heathenish elements together, forming of them a fantastic religious philosophy.

The same thing was also done by Cerinthus, whose followers observed the Mosaic law. According to his teaching, the Creator of the world is an angel named Demiurgus; Jesus Christ is a man only, with whom at his baptism "the word," Logos or Christ, was united and worked in him, but left him before his death, when he again became a mere man, as the Logos could not suffer or die.

The Nicolaitanes and Bileamites, who were Gnostic in their teaching and Antinomists in their lives, held, in common with Cerinth, a grossly sensual doctrine of a future glorious kingdom on earth, called Chiliasmus.

Simon Magus, the "father of all heretics," stands outside of Christianity altogether. According to his system, Ennoia (*εννοια*,

¹ De praeser. haeret. c. 2.

thought) emanated from the highest God, and other spirits from her. These formed the world, conjured souls into material bodies, and even held Ennoia herself imprisoned in the person of the courtesan Helena of Tyre. It was to liberate her that the “great power of God” ($\deltaύναμις θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη$) appeared in Simon, who in appearance suffered in Judea. The only condition of redemption is to acknowledge Simon as the highest power of the Supreme Being. The observance of the law availeth nothing.

Menander, the successor of Simon, who introduced a sort of baptism, and Dositheus, who claimed to be the Messias, were also founders of sects. They were from Samaria.

§ 26. *Gnosticism.*

The first heresy which seriously threatened the existence of the Church was the false Gnosis, which may be traced back to the apostolic age.

As to the origin of this heresy opinions differ. Moehler maintains that it sprang immediately and directly from Christianity itself, passing from a practical exaggeration of morals to a speculative system. Others trace it to an amalgamation of Hellenistic (especially of Platonic) ideas, with Philonic and Oriental philosophies (Parsismus and Buddhism), together with the doctrines of Christianity.

The fundamental principles of Gnosticism are : —

1. The Supreme Being. Bythos ($\betaυθός$), stands at the head of the world of spirits. To him is opposed either an eternal matter or an evil principle — (Dualism).

2. From the Supreme Being emanates the whole series of beings constituting the spirit-world ; namely, the divine spirits, or aéons ($αἰώνες$). These emanations become weaker in proportion as they are farther off from Bythos, so that the weakest aeon of this abundance falls down into matter.

3. Now is the world wrought into form from matter already at hand. It is the work of the Demiurgus ($\deltaημιουργός$), who by some Gnostics is deemed a good being, but of limited power ; by others he is thought to be a spirit inimical to the Bythos. This Demiurgus is the Jehovah of the Jews. Men's bodies were formed by him. Their souls are of divine origin, which in an unnatural way are united to these bodies.

4. And it is this union of contradictory elements, of the spiritual essence with material forms, which is the source of evil.

5. The æon Christ, sent by Bythos, made his appearance in order to rescue the imprisoned spirits. According to some Gnostics he united himself with the man Jesus; according to others, he had only an ethereal body or the appearance of a body (doketismus). His mission was to communicate to souls the knowledge of their higher origin. The example, suffering, and crucifixion of Christ are therefore utterly useless.

6. The Gnostics divide men into three classes: *a.* Spiritual (Πνευματικοί, Gnostics); *b.* Physical (Ψυχικοί, Catholies); *c.* Material (Ψυλικοί, Pagans). The spiritual are capable of the highest knowledge (γνῶσις); the physical, alone of faith (*πίστις*); whilst the material are hopelessly in the power of matter.

7. The doctrines of morality are explained in accordance with these dogmatical opinions of the Gnostics, so that some professed an exaggerated yet often purely physical asceticism; others, however, went on to a formal Antinomianism.

It is peculiar to the Gnostics to divide their doctrines into esoteric and exoteric, after the fashion of the pagan mysteries, and to couch them in various fantastic figures of speech and in a variety of images, which are for the most part borrowed from mythology.

As far as regards the relationship that Gnosticism bears to Christianity, it stands in utter contradiction to it. Gnosticism is a negation of positive Christianity. The Gnostics, however, do not acknowledge this; they even maintain that their heresy was taught by Christ and his apostles. With this object in view, they mutilated the Holy Scriptures, rejecting or falsely interpreting whole chapters, and appealing to the new so-called Gospels and Revelations, as also to a secret instruction of the apostles, which they claim to have received from their own disciples.¹

§ 27. *Different Forms of Gnosticism.*

1. According to Basilides, who about the year 125 came from Smyrna into Egypt, an ineffable Being, a Deity not existing for time (τὸ ἄρρητον — θεὸς οὐκ ὁρατός), created out of nothing the germ (πανσπερμία τοῦ κόσμου) from which the world evolved as the bird from the egg. In this germ lay a threefold sonship (νιότης τριμερής), which constantly aspires after the Primordial Being. But only the first completely attained to this. The second wafted upwards on the wings of the Holy Spirit, reached but to the outward boundaries;

¹ *Mussuet*, Dissert in Iren. libr.

while the third remained behind in the germ of the world, and is still needing redemption, still awaiting the purification it requires. From this germ of the world issued, according to the will of the Primordial Being, the first and second Archon, each of whom begot a son more perfect than himself. The first Archon created the ethereal world, the so-called Ogdoads; but the second formed the planetary heaven, the Hebdomas. In the beginning, the first of these considered himself the highest God, until he learnt to know the other by means of his son, when he submitted himself to him. The whole Ogdoads was converted with him, and hereupon in the same manner the Hebdomas, from whom knowledge, or the Evangelie, of three hundred and sixty-five spiritual kingdoms (*ἀβραξας*) comes. The lowest world developed of itself.

The third sonship, which had been bound in matter, was also set free by Jesus. He was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, and unites the spiritual, physical, and material elements in his own being. His mission is to reveal the Unnamable, to purify the third sonship, to separate all the elements in order to readjust them in their proper places, which is called *ἀποκατάστασις*. His sufferings were of no avail. Finally, a great ignorance was occasioned by the Ineffable God, that no being might seek for aught that did not correspond to his own nature. Many points of this system were altered by the disciples of Basilides, the most prominent of whom was his own son Isidore. They led dissolute lives.

2. Much more ingenious is the system taught by Valentin of Alexandria, who came to Rome to diffuse his errors in 140. Here he was excommunicated, and he died at Cyprus (160). In his system the Supreme Being dwelt in an unfathomable abyss, with *Eννοια* (thought) or *Σιγή* (silence). They begot *Νοῦς*, or *Μονογενῆς* (intelligence, or the only begotten) and *Αλήθεια* (truth). Intelligence and truth produced the word (*Λόγος*) and the life (*Ζωή*), who in their turn engendered man (*Ἄνθρωπος*) and the Church (*Εκκλησία*). The eight aeons form the Ogdoads. Five other pairs of aeons, or syzygies, then proceed from Logos and Zoe, and six more from Anthropos and Ecclesia. All the thirty aeons together constitute the *Πλήρωμα* (plenitude), to which the *Κένωμα* (chaotic void) is opposed.

The last of the aeons (*Σοφία*, or wisdom), impelled by an ardent desire to ascend to Bythos, gave birth to the monster Achamoth (*ἡ κάτω σοφία*, inferior knowledge), who created so much disturbance in Pleroma that she was expelled by the aeon Horos. In order to restore harmony in Pleroma, Nous (intelligence) and Aletheia (truth)

engender the aeons Christ and the Holy Ghost; and from all the aeons together proceeds the aeon Jesus, or Saviour ($\Sigma\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\rho$), who is to redeem and become the future spouse ($\Sigma\acute{\iota}\zeta\gamma\sigma$) of Achamoth.

Driven out of Pleroma, Achamoth communicated to Chaos ($\kappa\acute{e}\omega\mu\alpha$) the seed of life, and gave birth to Demiurgus, who created the world out of Chaos as an image of Pleroma, and peopled it with pneumatic, psychic, and material natures. The Demiurgus, believing himself to be the Supreme Being, promised to his chosen people a Messias, with whom the Soter Jesus was united in baptism. When Jesus shall have brought all the Pneumatics (spiritual men) to a perfect knowledge ($\gamma\acute{r}\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}s$), the Apokatastasis will follow: the Pneumatics with Soter and Achamoth will enter Pleroma; the Psychies will take an intermediate place between Pleroma and the physical world; and mere materialists, together with Hyle, will be consumed by fire.

This system was greatly modified by the numerous disciples of Valentin. The most celebrated of these are Secundus, Heracleon, Ptolomæus, and Marcus.

Akin to the Valentinians is the antinomistic sect of the Egyptian Ophites (Naaseni, serpent-worshippers), or those whose sacred symbol was the serpent. The most important branches of these are the Sethites, who traced the origin of the Pneumatics to Seth; and the Cainites, who had a devotion towards all whom the Scriptures branded with infamy, from Cain to Judas Iscariot.

Carpocrates of Alexandria and the African painter Hermogenes are rather philosophical sectarians of the Platonic school than Christians, although Christ had an honorable place in their system. According to this system everything proceeds from the Monas (unit), and must return to it. The world is the work of rebellious spirits. The chief object of man is through the Gnosis (knowledge) to raise himself to the Monas, by which he attains mastery over nature and spirit; this is effected by a psychic asceticism.

The social doctrines as developed by Epiphanes, son of Carpocrates, are subversive of all morality. Epiphanes died at the age of seventeen, and was worshipped by his followers with divine honors, in the island of Cephalonia.

The Antitactes and Prodigians indulged in a similar wanton libertinism, which included witchcraft and fortune-telling.

According to Saturninus of Antioch, in Syria, the spirit-world emanates from the unknown Father ($\pi\acute{a}\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\ \acute{a}\gamma\mu\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma$). The visible world was created by seven angels. The human race was partly created by angels, and illumined by a spark of divine light from the

Most High God; partly also it was produced by the evil principle (ὁ Σατανᾶς) out of the Hyle. Christ had no real body. Marriage and the eating of meat was forbidden to the adherents of this sect.

Bardesanes, a Syrian (about 170), was, according to Eusebius, a convert to Christianity from Valentinian-Gnosticism, while Epiphanius makes him an apostate from the Church. Bardesanes had a great many followers, who were chiefly attracted by the charming hymns composed by himself and his son Harmonius.

The Valentinian doctrine of the æons is also contained in the system of Tatian, who was the disciple of Justin the Martyr. Tatian became the founder of the Enkratites, or Continentes; also called Hydroparastatæ, or Aquarians. They abstained from marriage and animal food, and drank only water, even using it instead of wine at the Eucharistic sacrifice.

Marcion, who had been excommunicated by his own father, the Bishop of Sinope, in Pontus, developed his system at Rome (about 150) in conjunction with the Syrian Cerdö. He assumed as first principles (ἀρχαὶ), the good God of the Christians (ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθός), the severe Demiurgus of the Jews (ὁ δημιουργὸς δίκαιος), and afterwards probably also an evil one (ὁ ποιηρός or διάβολος). But the good God was altogether unknown to men, wherefore they adored the severe Demiurgus, whose precepts they could not observe. It was on this account he set apart the Jewish people, while all the rest of the world was sunk in idolatry and vice.

Marcion gave to his sect an ecclesiastical organization, with bishops and priests. Of the Holy Scripture he accepted only the Gospel of St. Luke and ten epistles of St. Paul, mutilated and garbled to be rendered conformable to his system.

His disciples, Marcus and Apelles, added Valentinian theories to his errors.

§ 28. *Manichæism.*

One of the heresies closely connected with that of Gnosticism, but which does not rank with the sects founded on Christianity, is that of Manes. From the two sources whence we derive information concerning his life we have contradictory reports, which agree, however, in asserting that Mani, or Manes, first promulgated his doctrine in Persia; then, after having travelled through many other countries of Asia, he returned to his native land, where at the command of Bahuram the Shah, or reigning governor, he was flayed alive as a religious impostor (277).

His doctrine, which is a compound of elements derived from the teaching of Zoroaster, Buddha, and Basilides, on which he strove to impress a Christian stamp, is as follows :—

Two kingdoms stand in opposition, one to the other,—the kingdom of light, ruled by God; and the kingdom of darkness, or of Hyle, which is governed by Satan.

In the kingdom of light the most perfect repose prevails. In the kingdom of darkness, on the contrary, a continual combat was ever going on, until the powers of darkness at length combined to make a common attack on the kingdom of light.

In order to defend himself from their attacks, the God of light caused the soul of the world ($\psi\chi\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\eta$) to emanate from himself. This is the original man, who, in union with the five pure elements, gained the victory over the Archon of darkness with his five impure elements; but in the strife he lost many rays of light, which became mingled with the Hyle, and made these capable of receiving a shape.

Hereupon followed the formation of the visible world by the living Spirit ($\zeta\omega\tau\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$, spiritus potens), who from the pure rays of light of the original man formed the sun and moon (Jesus impatiibilis), and from the rays appropriated by matter which had been rescued from the evil powers formed the remaining creatures of nature.

An image of the world, Mikrokosmos, is man, whom the Archon of darkness begot by his wife Nebrod. This man, Adam, who combines in himself portions of light and of Hyle, is akin alike to the good God and to the Archon of darkness. In this first man all the rays of light rescued from the original man were united, but are again dispersed as generation succeeds generation.

The object of the revolving world is the liberation of the souls of light. Christ came down from his throne in the sun to rescue the light enclosed in matter. The apostles, and still more their successors, falsely interpreted and misunderstood his doctrines; therefore he promised them a Paraclete, who now appeared in the person of Manes.

The Manichæans rejected most of the books of Holy Scripture; they held that the books of the Old Testament were inspired by the Demon, and they replaced many of those of the New Testament by fabrications of their own.

The disciples of Maues were divided into the imperfect (“auditores,” or hearers) and the perfect (“electi,” perfecti). On these was

imposed the obligation of observing the three seals,—seals of the mouth, of the hand, and of the bosom (“signaculum oris, manuum, sinus”).

They had also an exoteric and esoteric mode of worship. Their principal feast was a commemoration of the death of Manes, celebrated every March; it was called the feast of the *βῆμα*,—that is, of the teacher’s chair. The perfect—that is, the elect—had a so-called baptism and Eucharist.

The Manichaean sects also instituted an ecclesiastical hierarchy, consisting of a superior, to whom twelve masters and seventy-two bishops were subject, and presbyters and deacons, all selected from the rank of the elect.

The Manichaean sect attracted a great number of adherents in the Roman Empire, and was still in vogue, though under other names, during the Middle Ages.

§ 29. *The Anti-Trinitarian Sects.*

The Catholic doctrine of the trinity of persons in the unity of God’s essential existence gave rise to rationalistic interpretations of this holy mystery; the sects which arose therefrom are divided into three classes:—

1. The Ebionitic or Dynamic Anti-Trinitarians asserted that Christ was a mere man in whom resided a higher power.

To this sect belonged Theodotus, a tanner of Byzantium, who was excommunicated by Pope Victor. His disciples were Asclepiadotes and the broker Theodotus. Even the Confessor Natalis was led into this error, and became their bishop. But he was soon undeceived, and sought for readmission into the Church. Artemon, who affirmed that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ had been first introduced under Pope Zephyrinus (202–218), does not essentially differ from the preceding sect.

The proud and effeminate Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch (261), who also taught that Christ, though supernaturally born of a virgin, was a mere man in whom the divine Logos dwelt,—not, however, as a person, but as a power,—was in 269 convicted by Presbyter Malchion of error, at a synod in Antioch, and deposed by the assembled bishops. But the condemned man found a protector in Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, and continued in quiet possession of his see until 272, when the Emperor Aurelian put an end to Zenobia’s government. His sect lasted to the fourth century.

2. To the second class belong the so-called Patri-Passionists or Monarchians, who taught that the one true person of the Divinity had appeared in Christ.

Such errors were held by Praxeas of Asia Minor, who under Marcus Aurelius had been a confessor of the faith. He first taught them at Rome about 200; then in Africa, where he was opposed by Tertullian. He afterwards retracted his errors.

The same was taught by Noëtus of Smyrna, who lived towards the end of the second century. His disciple Epigonus transplanted these errors to Rome; and at the time of Pope Zephyrinus, Cleomenes was at the head of the whole party. The famous Libyan Sabellius took his place at a later date. This latter was excommunicated by Pope Callistus, with Hippolytus, his opponent, who went to the opposite extreme, making the Son inferior to the Father (Subordinationism). Hippolytus was reconciled to the Church before he died.

The Sabellian heresy differed from that of Noëtus in this: namely, that Sabellius assumed that the Holy Ghost existed, and also a Trias, a threefold manifestation, — not, however, as in the essential being of God, but only in the relations God had established between himself and the world and mankind. These three different modes of manifestation or of operation (*πρόσωπα*) are otherwise called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (Modalism). Pope Callistus was erroneously charged with Sabellianism by such opponents of Sabellius as denied the eternal personality of the Son.

As this heresy created a great excitement in the Libyan Pentapolis, St. Dionysius the Great of Alexandria (+ 264) wrote against it; but, having made use of some inaccurate expressions in his controversial treatises, concerning the personal distinction of the Logos from his Father, he was accused before Pope Dionysius of denying the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. The Pope, at a synod in 262, condemned the faulty expressions of Bishop Dionysius, whereupon the Alexandrian retracted the words which had been misunderstood, and declared positively that he believed the Son to be consubstantial (*όμοοίσιος*) and co-eternal with the Father.

3. A compromise between the Dynanists and the Patri-Passionists seems to have been attempted by Bishop Beryllus of Bostra, in Arabia. According to Eusebius, he taught that previous to his incarnation Christ did not exist as a person apart from the Father; neither had he, after his incarnation, a divinity proper to himself, but only such as dwelt in him from the Father. He also denied that

Christ had a human soul. It is not unlikely that he held the opinion afterwards defended by Apollinaris, that the place of the human soul in Christ was temporarily taken by the divine Logos. Being refuted by Origen at the Synod of Bostra (244), Beryllus willingly retracted his errors.

§ 30. *The Montanists and the Alogi. — Chiliasm.*

Montanus, a native of Ardaban in Phrygia, before he embraced Christianity (150), was probably a priest of Cybele. He claimed to be the powerful organ of the Paraclete, and to have the mission of leading the Church to its full and perfect development. Two eccentric women — who, like their leader, claimed that they possessed the gift of prophecy — joined him. These pseudo-prophets soon found followers. Even the excommunication pronounced against them by the bishops of Asia Minor could not set bounds to the increase of their sect. Montanus and the two women sought to bring over the Pope (Eleutherius or Victor?) to their side. But the exposition of their doctrine, made to him by Praxeas at the right moment, prevented their being readmitted into the Church.

The Montanists, also called Pepuzians (from Pepuz, in Phrygia) and Cataphrygians, differed from the Church less in their doctrine than in their discipline, which Montanus claimed to have brought to perfection; therefore they called their sect the Church of the Holy Ghost, and claimed for themselves the distinction of being spiritual men (*pneumatici*), separated from the Catholic (*psychici*) by rejecting second marriage as adultery, by introducing long and severe fasts, and by other hyper-rigoristic obligations, such as the prohibition to flee from persecution, the rejection of outward adornment and of worldly knowledge. Any one who had committed a grievous sin after baptism might be admitted to ecclesiastical penance, but should forever remain excluded from communion with the Church. Many Montanists were believers in Chiliasm; others fell into the errors of Noetus. The last edict against this obstinate sect appeared under Justinian, in 530.

The most prominent man among them was Tertullian, who joined them about 200, and who, finding the adherents split into different parties, endeavored to reduce their various errors into a system.

Closely connected with the Montanists is the sect called, by Epiphanius, the Alogi. These, according to Döllinger, are a branch of the Montanists, who did not deny the divinity of Christ, although

they rejected the doctrine of the Logos. Others take the Alogi to be Anti-Montanists and Ebionistic Anti-Trinitarians.

Chiliasm is an erroneous opinion of Jewish origin. In the early times of the Church it was received by many, and even by some of the Fathers, who, however, excluded the immoral views. The Chiliasts imagine that Christ, after vanquishing Antichrist and his followers, and freeing the earth from the curse of sin, will for the space of one thousand years (Apoc. xx. 1) continue to reign on earth with the resuscitated just, after which lapse of time the general resurrection and the last judgment will occur.

This expectation of a future millennium was highly favored by Papias. It was opposed by the presbyter Catus (+ 220) and by the catechetical school of Alexandria.

Hieracas, an Egyptian ascetic, taught Gnostic and Montanistic errors. He rejected marriage, denied the resurrection, and believed that children who died before attaining knowledge did not enter heaven.

§ 31. *Refutation of Heresies.*

In order to show the falsity of heresies in a manner clearly to be understood by all, the Fathers and writers of the Church were not content with scientific arguments drawn from reason, but principally endeavored to prove that heresy was in contradiction to the doctrine of Christ and of the apostles; to which they added the rule of faith, by means of which the truth or falsehood of any doctrine may be securely decided on.

This rule of faith is Apostolical Tradition, which the Fathers of the Church always opposed to heresy. St. Irenaeus (Adv. haer.) and Tertullian (De praescript. haeret.) have specially distinguished themselves by deducing and demonstrating this principle of tradition. Their principal views on the subject are the following:—

The Church of Christ is, as expressed by her name “Catholic Church,” the one¹ institution for salvation which is to endure to the end of time, which embraces all nations, and to which every one must belong who is seeking to save his soul.²

The vital principle of this Church is faith,³ which Christ com-

¹ Cyp. De unitate eccl.

² Cyp: l. c. c. 6. Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem. Cf. Ep. 74, c. 7.

³ Iren. iii. 24, 1. Hoc enim ecclesiae creditum est Dei munus (scl. files) quem-

mitted to the apostles, and the apostles to the Church.¹ Therefore the Church alone is in possession of the pure and the whole truth, since the apostles had neither a secret² (esoteric) doctrine, nor did they accommodate themselves to the opinions of their hearers, but rather, complying with the command of their Divine Master, have they labored to communicate the whole treasure of faith as the common good to all men.

Therefore the Church, coming down from the apostles, not only possesses the truth in its original purity and fulness, but that purity and fulness are guaranteed, (1) By the uninterrupted succession of bishops coming down from the apostles, and as it were protracting their lives³ until the present time; (2) By the never-ceasing assistance of the Holy Ghost,⁴ who protects the Church against error.

The proper bearers and teachers of the truths of faith are the bishops, who have received the sure chrism of truth, together with the episcopal succession. Without bishops there is no Church.⁵ The faithful can only in so far bear witness to the apostolic tradition as they themselves are subordinate to their bishops.⁶

Among all the bishops, the Bishop of Rome possesses the highest authority in teaching. He is the head and central point of the Universal Church, and to his teaching all other churches or their bishops must conform.⁷ It is by this unity in teaching that all the churches preserve the apostolic tradition,⁸ since the churches singly constitute but one whole, as the rays of the sun or the branches of a tree.⁹ This is also seen from the fact that all the

admodum ad inspirationem plasmatio*n*i, ad hoc, ut omnia membra percipientia vivificantur.

¹ *Iren.* Adv. haer. iii. 4, 1. Tantae igitur ostensiones cum sint, non oportet adhuc quaerere apud alios veritatem, quam facile est ab ecclesia sumere; cum apostoli, quasi in depositarium dives, plenissime in eam contulerint omnia, quae sint veritatis: uti omnis quicunque velit, sumat ex ea potum vitae. Cf. iii. 5, 1.

² *Iren.* iii. 14, 2.

³ *Tert.* De praescr. haeret. c. 20, 32.

⁴ *Iren.* iii. 24, 1. Ubi enim ecclesia, ibi et spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia: spiritus autem veritas.

⁵ *Cyp.* Ep. 66, c. 8. Ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia.

⁶ *Iren.* iii. 4, 1, 2.

⁷ *Iren.* iii. 3, 2. See § 21.

⁸ *Tert.* De praescr. haeret. c. 32. Ut multo posteriores (scil. ecclesiae), quae denique quotidie instituuntur: tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus apostolicae deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinae.

⁹ *Cyp.* De unit. eccl. c. 5. Ecclesia quoque una est, quae in multitudinem latius incremento foecunditatis extenditur. Quomodo solis multi radii sed lumen unum; et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum; et cum de fonte uno

single churches agree perfectly on the articles of faith, from which it follows that faith is not a compound formed of private opinions, but an apostolice tradition.¹

The criterion of the truth or falsity of any doctrine is therefore its agreement with the faith of the apostolical² Church and of all the churches that are in union with the Roman Church; for a doctrine is only true and of apostolice origin in the measure in which it agrees with these churches, while one that is new and false,³ not being in harmony with these churches, must be rejected.

This standard and criterion of the true faith must be applied to every one who brings his subjective opinions⁴ to place them in the stead of the God-revealed faith, thereby to disturb⁵ the unity. Such persons must be challenged to prove the antiquity of their doctrine as coming down to them through the unbroken succession of their bishops, and as thus being identified with the teachings of the apostolice churches, and especially with that of the Roman Church.⁶ But since the adherents of the various forms of heresy,

ri vi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copiae largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine . . . sic et ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit; unum tamen lumen est, quod ubique diffunditur, nec unitas corporis separatur. Ramos suos in universam terram copia ubertatis extendit, profluente largiter rivos latius expandit; unum tamen caput est et origo una, et una mater foecunditatis successibus copiosa. Illius foetu nascimur, illius lacte nutrimur, spiritu ejus animamur.

¹ *Tert.* c. 28. Ecquid verisimile est, ut tot ac tantae in unam fidem erraverint? Nullus inter multos eventus unus est. Exitus variasse debuerat ordinem doctrinae ecclesiarum. Ceterum quod apud multos unum invenitur, non est erratum.

² *Iren.* iii. 4, 1. Et si de aliqua modica quaestione disceptatio esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas recurrere ecclesias, in quibus apostoli conversati sunt, et ab eis de praesenti quaestione sumere quod certum et re liquidum est?

³ *Tert.* De praescr. c. 21. Constat proinde, omnem doctrinam quae cum illis ecclesiis apostolice, matricibus et originalibus fidei, conspiret, veritati deputandam; sine dubio tenentem, quod ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit. Reliquam vero omnem doctrinam de mendacio praedicandam; quae sapiat contra veritatem ecclesiarum et apostolorum, et Christi, et Dei.

⁴ *Iren.* iii. 12, 7. Arguuntur vero isti (sel. haeretici) nou quidem apostolorum, sed suae malae sententiae esse discipuli. Propter hoc autem et variae sententiae sunt uniuscujusque eorum, recipientis errorem, quem admodum capiebant. Ecclesia vero per universum mundum ab apostolis firmum habens initium, in una et eadem de Deo et de Filio ejus perseverat sententia.

⁵ *Iren.* iv. 33, 7. Magnum et gloriosum corpus Christi conscientia et dividunt, et quantum in ipsis est, interficiunt (sel. haeretici).

⁶ Cf. *Cyp.* De unit. eccl. c. 3. Hoc (the falsification of truth) eo fit . . . dum ad veritatis originem non redditur nec caput quaeritur nec magisterii coelestis doctrina servatur.

which are without exception of a later origin¹ and bear the stamp of disunion and of mutability,² cannot afford the proof required of them,³ they fall back on the Holy Scriptures, claiming them to be the only source of faith.

But this appeal avails nothing; for (1) The Scriptures are the property of the Church, and the tradition which is necessary to explain them is older than those Scriptures;⁴ (2) The interpretation of the Scriptures is included in the office of the Church,⁵ which is authorized by Christ to teach and explain his doctrine;⁶ (3) Heretics garble their own Bibles, reject some of the books, and give untrue explanations of many passages.⁷

§ 32. *Action and Teaching of the Church respecting Heresy.*

The attacks made by heretics on different articles of faith compelled the apostles, in the first place, and, later on, the Fathers and writers of the Church, clearly to expound and fundamentally to defend these doctrines.

There was a special necessity for them to defend and establish

¹ *Iren.* iii. 4, 3; v. 20, 1. Omnes ii valde posteriores sunt quam episcopi, quibus apostoli tradiderunt ecclesias. *Tert.* De praescr. c. 34, 35. *Cyp.* De unit. eccl. c. 12.

² *Ign.* Ant. ad trall. c. 11. *Tert.* De praescr. c. 40. *Cyp.* De unit. eccl. c. 3: Haereses invenit et schismata (scl. diabolus) quibus subverteret fidem, veritatem corrumperet, scinderet unitatem. Cf. c. 19. *Eus.* H. E. iv. 7.

³ *Iren.* iii. 24, 2. Alienati vero a veritate, digne in omni voluntantur errore, fluctuati ab eo, aliter atque aliter per tempora de iisdem sentientes, et nunquam sententiam stabilitam habentes; sophistae verborum magis volentes esse quam discipuli veritatis. Cf. v. 20, 2. *Tert.* De praescr. c. 14, 42: Schisma est unitas ipsis (scl. haereticis).

⁴ *Iren.* iii. 1, 2 sqq. *Tert.* De praescr. c. 19.

⁵ *Tert.* De praescr. c. 37. Si enim haeretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt; non a Christo habendo, quod, de sua electione sectati, haereticorum nomine admittunt. Ita non Christiani, nullum jus capiunt Christianarum litterarum, ad quos merito dicendum est: Qui estis? quando, et unde venistis? quid in meo agitis, non mei?

⁶ *Iren.* iv. 26, 5. Ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud quos est ea quae est ab apostolis successio. . . . Hi enim . . . fidem custodiunt . . . et scripturas sine periculo nobis exponunt. Cf. iv. 33, 8.

⁷ *Iren.* iii. 11, 1 sqq. *Tert.* De praescr. c. 17: Haeresis non recipit quasdam scripturas; et si quas recipit, non recipit integras adjectionibus et detractionibus ad dispositionem instituti sui intervertit. Et si aliquatenus integras praestat nihilominus diversas expositiones commentata convertit. Cf. c. 38. *Eus.* H. E. v. 28. *Cyp.* De unit. eccl.: Corruptores evangeli atque interpretes falsi. *Tert.* De praescr. c. 23: Credant sine scripturis, ut contra scripturas erendant (scl. haeret.).

the unity, indivisibility, and absolute perfection of God against the pagans and dualistic Gnostics; as also to proclaim the unity and trinity¹ of God, the consubstantiality and distinctive personality of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in view of the contradictory doctrines of the Anti-Trinitarian Monarchians and Subordinationists. Further, in course of time it became necessary clearly to define the scientific use of words in speaking of the dogmas of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation, in order to prevent further misunderstanding and inaccuracies.

The Fathers also brought forward in forcible language the whole history of the creation, of matter and spirit produced from nothing, affirming that this creation was good; as also that the whole world was sustained and governed by God, in confutation of the emanistic and pantheistic theories of the Gnostics.

Then, following the example of St. John, the Fathers were not less zealous in combating the two extremes of Ebionitism and Doketism, by proving the true divinity and humanity of Christ, with their hypostatic union.

Finally, the Holy Fathers were obliged clearly to establish that man is an image of God, that he consists of soul and body, that he has free will; they also had to defend the doctrine of original sin, and to define the nature of sin, in view of the Gnostic errors.

By such explanations and such courses as these, ecclesiastical writers, albeit it may be true that they did not always find suitable words for the expression of Christian truth, produced a mass of valuable testimony to the real doctrines of the Church, which also found a corresponding exponent in the ancient hymns, public prayers, in artistical representations and monuments, as also in the symbols of faith, denominated creeds. The most ancient of these is the Apostles' Creed. Beside which there exist many symbols framed for individual churches.

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

§ 33. *The Holy Sacraments.—Baptism and Confirmation.—Controversy on the Validity of Baptism when conferred by Heretics.*

In apostolic times holy baptism, the effects of which are expressed by the very names — regeneration, water of life, divine fountain, and the like — which the Holy Fathers applied to it, was conferred imme-

¹ See § 23. *Tert. adv. Prax. c. 21: Trinitas unius Divinitatis.*

diately on such persons as professed belief in Christ (Acts viii. 37 ; x. 47 ; xvi. 15, 33). At a later period those who desired to be baptized were made to wait a longer time, till they were instructed in Christian truth, and were prepared to receive duly this great sacrament. They were received as catechumens, with prayer, and the laying on of hands.

Since the fourth century catechumens (*κατηχούμενοι*) have been divided into three classes, — “audientes” (*ἀκρούμενοι*), hearers; “genuflectentes” (*γονυκλίνοντες*), genuflectors; “competentes aut electi” (*φωτιζόμενοι*), competent or elect.

A short time before baptism was administered, they were instructed in the symbol of faith (the Apostles' Creed) and the Lord's Prayer (the Our Father).

Baptism, which was preceded by a formal renunciation of Satan,¹ was administered by a threefold immersion in the water, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.² This threefold immersion, however, was by no means absolutely necessary for the validity of the sacrament, which in cases of necessity, as of sickness, was also administered by pouring water over the person to be baptized, or even by sprinkling³ (“baptismus clinicorum,” the baptism of the bedridden). Deacons were by, to assist the men or boys; deaconesses,⁴ to assist women and girls. The baptismal water received a special consecration for this purpose.⁵ In the beginning, baptism could be conferred anywhere; later on, baptisteries were erected for this purpose. Ordinarily the bishop himself was the administrator of this sacrament; but priests and deacons conferred it by his authority, and in case of necessity even laymen⁶ were allowed to baptize. The principal days set apart for the solemn administration of baptism were Holy Saturday and the Vigil of Pentecost, to which the Orientals added, in after times, the feast of the Epiphany. It is probable that the origin of sponsors, mentioned in the second century, dates back to the apostolic age. Also, from the earliest times, the power of expiating sin was attributed to the baptism of blood⁷ and of desire.⁸ A peculiar custom was that of being baptized for the dead.⁹

¹ *Tert.* De coron. milit. c. 3; De spectac. c. 4. *Cyp.* Ep. 76.

² *Just.* Apol. i. 61.

³ *Cyp.* Ep. 76. Cf. *de Rossi*, Rom. ii. 334.

⁴ *Const.* Apost. iii. 15.

⁵ *Cyp.* Ep. 70.

⁶ *Tert.* De bapt. c. 17: Baptismus aequae Dei census ab omnibus exerceri potest. Cf. *Cone.* ii. lib. (305), c. 38.

⁷ *Cyp.* Ep. 73.

⁸ *Cyp.* Ep. 73.

⁹ 1 Cor. xv. 29. *Tert.* De resurr. carnis, c. 48.

It is true that the baptism of children in the apostolic ages cannot be proved decisively from the Holy Scriptures, but the Holy Fathers¹ positively affirm it. Many catechumens deferred their baptism until they were in imminent danger of death, either for fear that they could not comply with the duties of the Christian religion or from other cause. The newly baptized received the kiss of peace, and, in some districts, a mixture of milk and honey. An anointing with oil also took place at baptism.

But this anointing is to be distinguished from that accompanying the sacrament of confirmation,² which in former times was for the most part conferred immediately after baptism. The rite of this sacrament consisted in prayer, laying on of hands by the bishop, and anointing with holy oil (*χρίσμα*). If the bishop could not personally administer baptism, he gave confirmation later on.

In the third century a controversy, which was far from insignificant, arose concerning the validity of baptism conferred by heretics.³ A synod held at Carthage between 218 and 222, under Bishop Agripinus, and two Oriental synods, — that of Synnada and that of Iconium (230–235), — ordered that heretics who sought to re-enter the Church should be re-baptized: while other churches followed the contrary practice.

As all the bishops of Africa were not willing to submit to the decision of these councils, eighteen Numidian bishops referred the question as to the validity of baptism by heretics to the decision of a Carthaginian synod, held in 255. The thirty-one bishops present at this synod, over which St. Cyprian presided, decided that baptism conferred by heretics is not valid; they held that the validity of the sacrament was dependent on the worthiness of the minister, although they had to admit that ancient custom was against their opinion. Another synod of seventy-one bishops confirmed this decision in the following year, when the acts of these synods were sent to Rome. Pope Stephen, however, who had already defended the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, against the bishops of Asia Minor, forbade the re-baptism of heretics, and commanded that the ancient tradition respecting their reception into

¹ *Orig.* in Rom. v. 6: Ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptisnum dare. On the general custom of baptizing children in the third century, see *Cyp.* Ep. 59.

² *Tert.* De bapt. c. 7, 8. Dehinc (after baptism) manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum sanctum.

³ *Cyp.* Ep. 69–75. *Eus.* vii. 3 sqq.

the Church should be observed.¹ He firmly insisted on this his declaration, although the arguments he adduced may not have been the most solid and profound.

Immediately after, or perhaps even before, receiving the letter from the Pope, St. Cyprian convoked a third synod of eighty-seven bishops, who unanimously agreed with his views, and communicated the acts of the synod on this subject to Bishop Firmilian. Cyprian, however, and Stephen (+ 257), never entirely broke with each other; and under Stephen's successor St. Dionysius of Alexandria succeeded in restoring a good understanding between the Apostolic See and the church of Carthage.²

The question was finally set at rest by the synods of Arles (314) and of Nice (325), who decided according to the views held by the Pope. This matter was afterwards more thoroughly sifted, and the ancient practice theologically defended, by St. Augustine in his controversy with the Donatists.

§ 34. *Celebration of the Holy Eucharist.*

The central point of all worship was the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, in which, according to the words of St. Hippolytus,³ "the precious and immaculate body and blood of Christ are daily consecrated and offered up on the mystical and divine table, in commemoration of that ever memorable table at which the mysterious and divine banquet first took place."

The doctrine contained in this passage is that of the whole Christian Church of antiquity, namely: —

1. The real presence of Christ in the most holy sacrament of the altar, which the most ancient Fathers⁴ declare in such clear terms, and which besides is understood by the very names applied to it, — "Αρτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, bread of God (*Ign. ad Eph.*); "Sanctum," the Holy One; "Corpus Domini," the body of the Lord (*Tertullian*); — also in the effects⁵ which in the most ancient Christian documents are

¹ *Cyp. Ep. 74.* The Pope ordained: *Si quis ergo a quacunque haeresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in poenitentiam, cum ipsis haereticis proprie alterutrum ad se venientes non baptizent, sed communicent tantum.*

² Cf. *Cyp. Ep. 82.* See, on the controversy of baptism by heretics, *Migne, Cursus patrol.* tom. iii. col. 1009 sqq.

³ In *Prov. ix. 1.*

⁴ *La perpétuité de la foi de l'église touchant l'eucharistie*, tom. iv. 4. Paris, 1704.

⁵ *Tert. De praeser. c. 36*: *Fidem eucharistia pascit.* *Cyp. Ep. 54*: *Cum ad hoc*

attributed to the Holy Eucharist, and which are expressed in the symbolical pictures of catacombs¹ in the most unequivocal language.

2. The sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist is in like manner taught by the ancient Fathers in their very nomenclature, — *θυσία* (sacrifice), *προσφορά* (oblation), *δῶρα* (gift); “oblatio,” “sacrificium dominicum,” etc.;² — in the comparison wherewith they liken it to the offering of Melchisedec;³ in the appeal made by the Fathers⁴ to Malachi i. 11; nay, in the accusation made by the pagans themselves, that the Christians held bloody feasts in their assemblies,⁵ — banqueted after a Thyestic fashion. According to St. Justin,⁶ the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice took place in the following manner: —

First, several prayers were offered up, and passages from Scripture read, on which the bishop gave a homily (“missa catechumenorum”). This ended the Mass of the catechumens, who had then to retire; and the Mass of the faithful began. Then these faithful rose again to pray, and gave each other the kiss of peace. This was followed by the presentation to the bishop of bread, wine, and water⁷ mixed, over which he pronounced the words of consecration;⁸ that is, he spoke over them the words used by our Lord in instituting this sacrifice at the Last Supper. All the people then answered Amen. After the bishop’s communion, the deacons distributed the body and blood of Jesus Christ to all the faithful present (“missa fidelium”). They then carried Holy Communion to those absent, from sickness or imprisonment.

fiat eucharistia, ut possit accipientibus esse tutela, quos tutos esse contra adversarium volumus munimento Dominicæ saturitatis armemus; nam quomodo docemus aut provocamus eos, in confessione nominis sanguinem suum fundere, si eis militaturis Christi sanguinem denegamus? aut quo modo ad martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos prius ad bibendum in ecclesia poculum Domini jure communicationis admittimus? . . . Primo idoneus esse non potest ad martyrim, qui ab ecclesia non armatur ad praelium: et mens deficit, quam non recepta eucharistia erigit et accedit.

¹ On the symbol of the *ιχθύς*, cf. *Aug. Civ. Dei*, xviii. 13; *Confess.* xiii. 23. Solemitatem . . . qua ille piscis exhibetur, quem levatum de profundo terra pia comedit.

² *Iren. Adv. haer.* iv. 19, 4: Verbum quod offertur Deo. *Cyp. Ep.* 54.

³ *Cyp. Ep.* 63.

⁴ *Just. Dial. e. Trypho.* e. 117.

⁵ *Minuc. Felix*, l. c. e. 9.

⁶ *Apol.* i. 65 sqq.

⁷ *Iren. v. 1, 3.* *Cyp. Ep.* 63.

⁸ *Just. Apol.* i. 66. *Iren. v. 2, 3:* Ὁπότε οὖν καὶ κεκραμένον ποτήριον καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

The bread used in the Eucharist was partly leavened, partly unleavened. In the beginning, the faithful received Holy Communion every day under both species. Yet some facts prove that sometimes it was given under one species alone, both inside and outside the Church.¹ The people received it in their hands. Bishops used to send it to one another as a sign of communion.

From very early times the holy sacrifice of the Mass was offered up for the dead, for the salvation of the living, at the celebration of a marriage, and in honor of the martyrs. It was usually a bishop who undertook the office; but the priests could also celebrate Mass, either with the bishop or without him. That the Christians at their religious services sang psalms and hymns, is related not only by Justin and Tertullian, but also by the pagan governor Pliny, in his official letter to Trajan.

In accordance with 1 Cor. x. 16, the ancient Fathers often call the Holy Eucharist Eulogy (*εὐλογία*). Since the fourth century such portions of bread as were blessed during Mass served partly for the support of clergy, partly for distribution at the conclusion of the service among such of the faithful as had not received communion, like the *ἀντιδώρα* of the Greeks. These were also called Eulogiae.

In the apostolic ages the services concluded with Agapæ, or love-feasts. These, albeit of apostolic origin, were suppressed in the fourth century, on account of the abuses to which they gave rise.²

The oldest liturgy is that contained in the Apostolic Constitutions, and is called the Clementine Liturgy. This in its essential points is the one that was instituted by the apostles after the example of Christ. This is manifest from the connection it bears to the Jewish Paschal ritual.

§ 35. *The Sacrament of Penance.—Penitential Discipline.—Schism of Felicissimus and Novatian.*

Those Christians who had lost the grace of baptism by mortal sin could obtain the remission of their sins by penance ("baptismus laboriosus"), which was also called the second plank after shipwreck of the soul ("secunda post naufragium animæ tabula").

¹ Examples of communion under one species are, that of the communion of the hermit Serapion (*Dion. Alex. ap. Eus.* vi. 44), and that of communion in private houses (*Tert. Ad uxor.* ii. 5): *Non sciet maritus (scil. ethnicus), quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes? et si sciverit panem, non illum credit esse, qui dicitur.*

² *Tert. Apol.* c. 39.

Sins were divided into two classes, according to their degree of grievousness, — deadly, or mortal sins (“*crimina mortalia*,” ἀμαρτία μαρτύρια θανατόφορα); and venial, or lesser sins (“*communia*”).¹ For the remission of sins, contrition, confession, and satisfaction were required. The entire act of penance — often, however, simply the manifestation of sins — was called confession (ἐξομολόγησις).

All sins, even the secret ones, were matter of confession² (“*materia confessionis*”). Confession itself was either public or secret. Only grievous sins publicly committed were obliged to be manifested publicly before the bishop, the clergy, and the whole community (? whether after private confession). Secret sins were subject to the advice of the confessor, and at his command had to be confessed in public, either wholly or in part.³ The penance to be performed was also either secret or public. Those whose grievous sins were known publicly, had to do public penance. Those whose sins, although grievous, were unknown to the public, were not compelled to this kind of penance; but they might of their own free will join themselves to the public penitents, or even be exhorted so to do by their confessor.⁴

In the ancient Church public penance for great crimes was permitted only once; and from it neither apostates, adulterers, nor murderers were excluded. Their readmission generally took place on the death-bed; but the penitentiary discipline was not yet uniform throughout the Church. Pope Zephyrinus commanded that after having fulfilled the prescribed satisfaction, adulterers should be again admitted to the communion of the Church. Callistus was still more lenient in his ordinances; and at the time of St. Cyprian, his letters attest that all sinners were admitted to penance, and, having acquitted themselves of this obligation, were readmitted to communion with the Church. Still some churches continued to deny readmission to apostates, and refused them Holy Communion. It belonged to the bishop to impose public penance, and to specify the way in which it should be performed. As long as the time

¹ *Orig.* Hom. xv. in Levitic. n. 2.

² *Orig.* Hom. iii. in Levitic. n. 4: *Si quid in occulto gerimus, si quid in sermone solo vel etiam intra cogitationum secreta commisimus, euneta necesse est publicari, euneta proferri.* *Cyp.* Ep. 11.

³ *Origen* speaks very plainly on the public confession of secret sins (Hom. ii. on the Thirty-seventh Psalm.) *Tert.* De poenit. c. 3, 10.

⁴ *Tert.* l. c. 9, 10. Whether all secret grievous sins were subjected to public penance is disputed.

lasted during which public penance was to be performed, the penitents were obliged to abstain from all amusements.

Sacramental absolution from venial sins, as also from mortal secret sins, was given by the priest who had heard the confession; yet public sinners were frequently summoned before the bishop and his presbytery for the sake of receiving absolution, after having made their confession. The solemn ceremony of bestowing peace ("pax") — that is, the reconciliation of the penitent and permitting him to receive the Holy Eucharist — was performed by the bishop himself or his vicar, after the public penance had been duly accomplished. Exceptions were made in the case of severe sickness, in times of persecution, and the like.

After the persecution of Decius, priests were intrusted with the direction of the penitentiary discipline. The public penitents were then separated into four classes, — "fleentes" or "liemantes" (*προκλαίοντες, χειμάζοντες*), "audientes" (*ἀκροάμενοι*), "genuflectentes" or "substrati" (*γονυκλίνοντες, ὑποπίπτοντες*), and "consistentes" (*συνιστάμενοι*).

Clerics of high rank who had been guilty of grievous sin were deposed, and only admitted to the communion of the laity ("ad communionem laicalem"). Whether they also were subjected to public penance is a disputed point. As a rule, the time of penance lasted long; it was, however, occasionally abridged, either from the penitent exhibiting extraordinary contrition, or at the intercession of martyrs languishing in prison and about to suffer death for the faith. This last cause of indulgence having in course of time become abused, some zealous bishops protested against the too frequent or too inconsiderate presentation of such petitions.

St. Cyprian's earnestly expressed disapproval of the misuse of these commendatory petitions ("libelli") of the martyrs gave rise to a strong opposition to him during his life, which, being fomented and encouraged by five priests who had objected to his election as bishop, broke out into a formal schism during the absence of St. Cyprian from Carthage.

The deacon Felicissimus, who had been excommunicated by Cyprian, put himself at the head of this schism. He was joined by some of the fallen ("lapsi") who had been irregularly readmitted, as also by some confessors who were angry that St. Cyprian had rejected their petitions.

The return of St. Cyprian, who at a synod excommunicated the leaders of this schism and issued new instructions respecting the readmission of the fallen (which instructions were entirely in

accordance with the Roman practice), did not succeed in fully restoring peace. The schismatic party stood its ground for a time under the anti-bishop Fortunatus, whom the notorious presbyter Novatus endeavored to have acknowledged in Rome.

Then came another rupture. This time the schismatics were headed by Novatian, a rigorist presbyter, who, being displeased with the mildness and moderation of Pope Cornelius, set himself up as anti-Pope at the instigation of Novatus, and let himself be consecrated by three Italian bishops. He succeeded by unworthy means in gaining many adherents and even in deceiving some bishops. The members of this sect assumed the name of the Pure (*καθαροί*). They denied all hope of pardon to the lapsed, and rebaptized those who joined their sect. One part of them rejected second marriage. This schism extended itself far beyond Rome, and did not entirely disappear till the seventh century.

§ 36. *Matrimony.—The Discipline of the Secret.*

As a rule, the marriages of Christians were contracted in the presence of the bishop, as is affirmed by St. Ignatius, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. A marriage validly contracted was indissoluble; and the "Pastor" of Hermas, and Clement of Alexandria, testify that only after the death of one of the parties was a second marriage allowed to the other.¹ Some Fathers do not favor second marriages at all.

The Discipline of the Secret ("Disciplina arcani") dated from the earliest ages of the Church. This was the keeping concealed from those who were not Christians certain doctrines, such as that of the Trinity, grace, and the sacraments, and certain rites of worship, such as the administration of baptism, celebration of Mass, and the like.

This Discipline of the Secret was based upon the admonition of Christ (Matt. vii. 6), and was rendered imperative by the persecutions and calumnies against the Church. Its existence is attested by the practice of not allowing heathens and catechumens to remain during the entire celebration of the Mass, as also in the fact that these last were only after a long probation, and shortly before being baptized, instructed in the mystery of regeneration and in the doctrines of the Eucharist and the holy sacrifice of the Mass. Origen² and

¹ *Hermae.* Past. II. mand. iv. 1, 4. *Athen.* Lege pro Christ. c. 34. *Theoph.* *Ant.* Ad Autol. iii. 15.

² *Orig.* c. Celsus, i. 7.

Tertullian¹ in their writings bear witness to this “*Disciplina arcani*,” by presupposing its existence. Only on the presupposition of this could the Synod of Alexandria (340) charge it to the Arians as a crime that they had spoken of the Holy Eucharist in the presence of pagans; nay, the reproach of the pagans to the Christians, that they were “a nation shunning the light,” had no other ground than this.

This usage is also proved by the symbolic pictures of the catacombs, and from the manner in which the Fathers speak of the Eucharist in such writings as are intended for non-Christians. St. Justin indeed speaks, on account of his apologetical purpose, more openly on baptism and the Holy Eucharist; but even in doing it, he bears witness to the “*Disciplina arcani*.²” The same testimonies also prove the continuance of this discipline during the persecutions and afterwards.

The assertion, therefore, that the heathens possessed the knowledge of Christian doctrines and worship is utterly false, although they may have had a confused notion of some mysteries; such a notion as led to the accusation that the Christians were consumers of human flesh (*ἀνθρωποφάγοι*), could only have originated in a misconception of the Holy Eucharist.

§ 37. *Sunday.—Ecclesiastical Feasts.—Contention concerning the Festival of Easter.*

Instead of the Jewish Sabbath,³ Christians celebrated the Sunday in commemoration of the resurrection of our Lord. In the East, as also in some churches in the West, the Sabbath was also kept. The principal festivals were those of Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany; afterwards the festival of Christmas was kept,—at first only in the West, but since the fourth century it has been generally solemnized throughout the East also.

On Sundays, as also during the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, the people did not fast, and prayed standing.

Already in very early times a contention of no small importance arose respecting Easter. This did not, however, regard the object of the feast—the redemption through the death of Christ—nor the liturgical celebration; it simply referred to the day on which the feast was to be celebrated.⁴

¹ *Tert. Apol.* c. 7.

² *Just. Apol.* i. 65.

³ *Acts* xx. 7. *1 Cor.* xvi. 2. *Apoc.* i. 10. *Tert. Apol.* c. 16.

⁴ *Eus. H. E.* v. 23 sqq.

Appealing to the example of the holy apostles John and Philip, the churches of Asia Minor always commemorated the day of our Lord's death (*πάσχα σταυρώσμου*) on the 14th day of Nisan (*ιδ'*), on whatever day of the week it might happen to fall, and the day of the resurrection (*πάσχα ἀναστάσμου*) on the 16th, if, indeed, they had more than one day for the commemoration of both these events, of which there is no certain record. Other churches, however, especially those of the West, always celebrated the feast of Easter on the Sunday following the *ιδ'*, — that is, the 14th day of Nisan, — and the commemoration of Christ's death on the preceding Friday.

To these two orthodox parties there was yet another, an heretical one, added, — that of the so-called Ebionistic Quarto-decimans, who insisted that the Paschal festival should be held on the 14th day of Nisan with the Jews, because the Mosaic law was still in force.

With the view of adjusting these differences and also of assimilating the regulations for fasting, St. Polycarp had, in 160-162, paid a visit to Rome to confer with Pope Anicetus on the subject; but they came to no decisive agreement on the matter. The differing practices continued to disturb the Church until, the Ebionistic Quarto-decimans having diffused their Judaizing views in Rome itself, Pope Victor I. was compelled to take stringent measures to enforce uniformity of discipline in this particular.

The members of the synods convoked by order of this Pope, at Rome, in Gaul, Pontus, Palestine, etc., declared it to be "ecclesiastical rule that the mystery of the resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than Sunday only."¹ The bishops of Asia Minor, at whose head was Polycrates of Ephesus, were the only ones who would not give up their old custom.

Whether Pope Victor, who had commanded, under pain of excommunication, the bishops of Asia Minor assembled in synod at Ephesus to regulate their practice respecting the time of celebrating Easter according to the universal observance of the Church, did, on receiving the synodal writing, put his threat into execution, is uncertain. If he did, he immediately, on the representation of St. Irenæus, revoked the excommunication that had been pronounced.

To settle all these disputes concerning the time that the Paschal festival should be celebrated, the Synod of Arles (314) ordained that Easter "should be celebrated on the self-same day, and at the same time, in every region of the earth." But as practical unity was not hereby defined, the Council of Nice decided that the Easter festival

¹ *Eus. H. E.* v. 23.

should be celebrated everywhere on the first Sunday after the spring full moon. The Bishop of Alexandria was commissioned to calculate beforehand the precise time for the celebration of Easter, and to communicate the result to the Pope.

A part of the Quarto-decimans still stuck to their ancient custom, even after the Council of Nice.

The difference in the calculations between Rome and Alexandria long continued as an impediment to uniformity in the computation of the precise time. This was not finally established till the Easter Tables of Dionysius Exiguus, computed on the foundation of the Alexandrian cycle of nineteen years, were adopted in the West; after this was agreed upon, uniformity was generally established.

§ 38. *Fast Days. — Places of Worship. — Life of the Christians.*

After the example of Christ (Matt. iv. 1 sqq.; ix. 17, 21) and of the apostles (Acts xiii. 2 sqq., xiv. 22.; 2 Cor. vi. 4, 5), the Christians used to fast on important occasions. They had also settled fast days, to which the station days, Wednesdays and Fridays and in Rome Saturdays, also belong. With regard to the forty days' fast (Lent) there existed a great difference. The day preceding a solemn feast day was observed as a vigil.

At the beginning, Christians met together for worship in private houses, and at times of persecution in other places, — as, for example, in the subterranean cemeteries, as the catacombs of Rome; in the fourth century, however, Christians already possessed in many places spacious and often beautiful edifices set apart for the worship of God.

The chapels in the catacombs were already adorned with various symbolical representations, types and emblems of Biblical truths. The custom became more and more common, as time wore on; and this in spite of the aversion many Christians had for images.

The cross was an object of peculiar veneration. The custom of making the sign of the cross is of very ancient date.¹ The benedictions or blessings of the Church² are mentioned by the oldest writers, whose works also afford us glorious testimonies concerning

¹ *Tert.* De coron. c. 3. Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad calcatum, ad lavaera, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quaecumque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus.

² *Cyp.* Ep. 70.

the veneration of saints¹ and their relics,² as also of the public and domestic life of Christians.

As a rule, the new converts kept to the same occupation they had formerly practised, unless that occupation was in any way connected with the worship of idols, or was sinful in itself.

Neither did the Christians in any way distinguish themselves from others in their clothing, dwelling-houses, or at their meals; but they carefully avoided every kind of indecency, extravagance, and lewdness. In like manner, though not enemies of respectable recreations, Christians held themselves aloof from all the sinful pleasures of the pagans,—from their public banquets, from dice, from the scenes of the theatre and of the arena, and from immodest dances.

Many Christians even considered the military profession as incompatible with their religion; many grew passionately fervent in their zeal against wearing jewelry, ornaments, or any other kind of finery; forbade the decorating of the dead with flowers, the hanging of wreaths upon their tombs, or binding a crown of blossoms around the brows of a deceased friend. Such spoke against second marriages in a manner not always consonant with the principles laid down by the Church.

The beneficial influence exercised by Christianity over its professors was especially visible in their domestic life, in their family devotions, in the relation which husband and wife bore to each other, which parents bore to their children, and superiors to their subjects. Further, the highest admiration of the pagans was excited in witnessing the care Christians took of their sick, of their necessitous brethren, and in beholding the mutual love they cherished for one another.

A pre-eminent fruit of the Christian spirit is the high esteem in which virginity is held. This special prerogative did not pass unnoticed by paganism.

It is evident enough, from the writings of the apologists, that a goodly number of Christians lived in perpetual virginity from youth upwards, and of their own free will renounced even the permitted

¹ *Iren.* Adv. haer. iii. 22, 4; v. 19, 1. Quemadmodum illa (scl. Eva) per angeli sermonem sedueta est, ut effugeret Deum, praevaricata verbum ejus; ita et haec per angelicum sermonem evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum, obediens ejus verbo. Et si ea inobedierat Deo; sed haec suasa est obediare Deo, *uti virginis Ecce Virgo Maria ficeret advocata.* Et quemadmodum adstrictum est morti genus humanum per virginem, salvatur per virginem.

² *Acta mart. s. Ign. Ant.* e. 6.

pleasures and enjoyments they might lawfully have pursued. These Christian ascetics (*ἀρκήται*) at first remained in the bosom of their families, in their domestic circle; in the course of time, however, they retired to solitary places, in order to devote themselves to the service of God in a more undisturbed manner.

St. Paul of Thebes is considered as the patriarch of the Hermits, the Anchorites (+ 340).

Lastly, the disposition which animated the Christians is shown in the perfect resignation with which they met their own death, and in the care they bestowed on the departed.

The Roman law permitted possession of burial places alike to private individuals as to whole societies (collegia), so that even during the times of persecution the Christians had their own places of interment, or cemeteries. These cemeteries were often very extensive, and formed a series of subterranean sepulchres. Corpses were interred in these with religious ceremonies. The tomb was then covered with a stone slab, to which a symbol and an inscription were affixed. As every sepulchre with the area surrounding it was, as a "locus religiosus," inviolable, the cemeteries offered a secure refuge during the persecutions, wherein the Christians could assemble for the celebration of the divine mysteries. But after the third century pagan fury intruded itself even into these holy places, which from that time offered little or no security to preserve themselves or their monuments from desecration. The surviving relatives of the deceased strove to come to the aid of their souls by prayer and by the sacrifice of the Mass.

In this way the Church, defamed and persecuted as she was, labored faithfully, and succeeded in complying with her high mission; but still better and better was she able to accomplish her work when the Pagan-Roman Pontifex Maximus (greatest high-priest), the Roman emperor, bent his knee before his Savior, and from an enemy became a protector of the Church.

PERIOD II.

*FROM THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE THE GREAT TO
THE SIXTH œCUMENICAL COUNCIL (680).*

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 39. *Christianity in the Individual Countries of Asia.*

In Persia,¹ where already, in the time of Constantine the Great, several bishoprics were in existence under the metropolitan see of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the Christians were undisturbed until the reign of Shapur II. (Sapor, 309–381), when they became the object of royal mistrust, as the hatred of the Persians against the Romans, their oppressors, extended itself to the Christians, and the political jealousies of the king, fomented by the Jews and the Magi, went so far as to occasion a cruel persecution of the Church.

Shapur first imposed an oppressive poll-tax on the Christians; but when he found that this did not effect his object he issued an edict (342) that the clergy should be put to death, and the churches torn down and despoiled of the sacred vessels. Symeon, the gray-headed Archbishop of Selencia, with a hundred priests, then died the death of martyrs.

Other edicts of bloody persecution followed, when numerous Christians suffered martyrdom, as few were found willing to deny their faith. In the last years of his reign Shapur took a more lenient course.

The condition of the Christians improved under King Iezdedscherd II. (Isdegerdes, 401–420), on whom Maruthas, Bishop of Tagrit

¹ In the chapter on "Church and State," the necessary information on the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire will be given, as that spread depended to a great extent on the conduct of the emperors towards the Church.

in Mesopotamia, had made a favorable impression, which lasted till the year 418, when the destruction of a Persian pyreum, or fire-temple, caused by the indiscreet zeal of Abdas, Bishop of Susa, called forth a persecution of the Church, which continued to rage under Bahram V. (Varanes, 420-438), but in which the cruelty of the Persians failed to shake the constancy of the Christians. It was not till the treaty of peace had been concluded with Theodosius II. (427) that Bahram became more mildly disposed towards the Christians; and this was mainly owing to Bishop Acacius of Amida, who, with the proceeds of Church property which he sold, ransomed seven thousand Persian prisoners of war, and restored them to their homes.

Unhappily at this time Nestorianism entered the land, which at a later date fell a prey to Islamism and rooted out Christianity, with the exception of a few scattered fragments here and there.

The chief apostle of Armenia is St. Gregory the Illuminator ($\phiωτιστής$), who in 302 converted the king, Tiridates III., and very successfully preached the gospel to his subjects. Bishop Mesrop in the fifth century made an Armenian translation of the Bible.

But here again interior dissensions impeded the work of conversion under the successors of St. Gregory, and the existence of Christianity was yet more endangered by the Persian conquerors, who endeavored to introduce fire worship into Armenia. The Christians rose, however, in defence of their faith, and in 483 won for themselves the free exercise of their religion and the right to destroy the fire temples. Some years later, however, the Nestorians succeeded in exciting the king anew against the Catholic religion.

After the fall of the Persian dynasty the Armenians, who at a Synod of Dovin (596) had received the Monophysite heresy, found new enemies in the Arabs.

A Christian female slave (Nunia, or Nino) brought the glad tidings of salvation to Iberia (Georgia). From Iberia the Christian doctrine spread to Albania, and in the sixth century also to the Lazi (Colchicans), the Abasgi, and other nations.

An embassy from Constantius, headed by Theophilus, an Indian from Diu, introduced Christianity to the Homerites, or Sabeans, in south Arabia. But the Church there found a dangerous enemy in the Jews, and in the sixth century was cruelly persecuted by the Jewish king Dhu-Nowas (Duncan). At the petition of the Patriarch Timotheus of Alexandria, King Elesbaan of Ethiopia took the per-

secuted Christians under his protection. But, alas! the country soon fell a prey to the Persians and to Mahometanism, and these put an end to Christianity.

It was at this period that Christianity found entrance into India and China.

§ 40. *The Christian Church in Africa.*

Frumentius and Ædesius, was Christian youths of Tyre, who had accompanied their uncle Meropius on a voyage of discovery, were the first apostles of the faith to Abyssinia, or Ethiopia. Meropius and the whole crew, save only the two brothers, were murdered. These two were brought to the capital Axuma, and by degrees rose so high in favor of the king, that after his death the queen intrusted the education of the royal children, together with the administration of the government, to Frumentius. Then these two Christian youths, being aided and assisted by some Roman merchants, began to work for the diffusion of Christianity. When after a while they were permitted to return to their own country, Ædesius became a presbyter at Tyre; but Frumentius (about 326, or later) was consecrated bishop by St. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, on which he again betook himself to Abyssinia, and, in spite of the opposition of the Arian Emperor Constantius, he labored very successfully. The dependence of Abyssinia upon Alexandria gave, at a later date, the victory to the Monophysite heresy, added to which Christianity there was much distorted by Jewish customs.

In Nubia it was a Monophysite priest, named Julian, who introduced Christianity to the country.

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

§ 41. *Paganism under Constantine the Great and his Sons.*

The victory which Constantine the Great obtained near Byzantium (323) over his co-emperor Licinius, who had taken on himself the protectorate of heathenism while he sorely oppressed and persecuted the Christians of his empire, was at the same time the victory of the Church over paganism. For the victor, now sole master of the Roman Empire, was more than ever inclined to favor Christianity, without, however, persecuting paganism. Only a few pagan temples, notorious for the immorality of their worship, were

destroyed ; only a few pagan priests, noted for imposture, were removed ; nay, only such pagan practices were suppressed as were accounted dangerous to the State or were connected with the more abominable debaucheries. It was at a later period that the emperor ordered the temples in many places to be closed, and the images of the idols to be dismantled. He is also said to have forbidden the *Sacrificia publica* by an edict, which was not, however, everywhere enforced.

The position which Constantine the Great held in common with his successors, who still retained the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, contributed not a little to the progress of the Church. The pagans embraced Christianity in great numbers, — many, doubtless, from conviction ; some, however, from other motives, not always so honorable.

The life of the great emperor himself is, unhappily, not free from blemish ; his cruel treatment of some members of his own family, — as of Licinius, and his son Licinian, — his conduct to his wife Fausta¹ and to his son Crispus, are greatly to be reprehended. Yet it must be remarked that the aforesigned persons owed their tragical death partly to calumny and partly also to their own fault.

Constantine, who became a Christian from conviction, not from political motives, received baptism on his death-bed, May 22, 337, in the fortress of Achyron, at the hands of Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia.

The sons of Constantine, Constantine II. (+ 340) and Constans (+ 350), and especially Constantius (sole ruler from 350 to 361), were still more solicitous than their father had been for the suppression of paganism. Edict after edict was issued, interdicting pagan sacrifices under penalty of death. The closing and demolition of many pagan temples followed, and the property belonging to them was confiscated. Such proceedings as these, instead of converting the pagans, often produced the opposite effect, making them more obstinate in their adherence to the old forms, and imparting to paganism a new vitality and importance. Besides which, Constantius, notwithstanding his exertions in favor of Christianity, tolerated the pagan sophists and the Neoplatonists even as rulers over the higher schools of learning. These things made it possible for his successor, Julian, to deem it feasible to restore paganism to the dominion of the world.

¹ This statement is contested with cogent reasons. See *Gibbon*, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

§ 42. *Attempt at the Revival of Paganism under Julian the Apostate.*

Julian, born 331, nephew to Constantine the Great, was brought up in Arianism, at the castle Macellum, in Cappadocia. But at Constantinople Ekebolis inspired him with a love of classic literature and of pagan worship. This love was fomented at Nicomedia by reading the writings of the pagan rhetorician Libanius, which he obtained secretly, and by frequenting the society of heathen theurgists, especially that of Maximus of Ephesus. At Athens the unhappy prince formed intimate relationships with the chief priests of the Eleusinian Mysteries, which raised his enthusiasm for paganism to a formal adhesion to its lore.

Lest, however, he should excite the suspicions of his imperial uncle Constantius, whose jealous cruelty had robbed him of his dearest relatives, Julian carefully disguised his true sentiments, and assumed the exterior behavior of a zealous Christian, while already dreaming of re-establishing the worship of the false gods. His efforts were successful. Constantius, deceived by his hypocrisy, elevated him to the dignity of Cæsar, and intrusted him with the supreme command of the army in Gaul. Here in a short time he gained the favor of the soldiers, who saluted him as Augustus. The death of the enraged emperor Constantius (361) prevented him from taking revenge by plunging the empire into a civil war, and left Julian sole ruler of the empire. Julian now threw off the mask, and openly espoused the side of paganism.

This sketch of Julian's life will instruct us as to the causes of his apostasy. His hatred to Constantius drew him nearer to the pagans; these flattered his ambition, and offered him a newly spiritualized polytheism in its most attractive form, whilst the Arian bishops and courtier Christians, by their lives and doctrines, inspired him with an aversion to the Christianity which he knew only as it was caricatured by Arianism.

The new Pontifex Maximus, on ascending the throne, cherished the double purpose of annihilating Christianity and of re-establishing the worship of the gods. The means the apostate intended to use are as follows:—

1. He excluded the “Galileans,” as he sneeringly termed the Christians, from all offices of public trust, compelled them to rebuild the pagan temples that had been destroyed, and forbade them to expound the heathen classics.

2. He endeavored to sow anew the seed of discord among the Christians by recalling the exiled bishops, with the view of re-exciting the ancient controversies, and by his own hateful attacks on the clergy to expose them to the mistrust of the laity.

3. He deprived the clergy of all the privileges and revenues which had been granted them by the preceding emperors.

4. He composed what he called a scientific refutation of their errors; but his book is, in fact, a ridicule of Christianity.

5. Finally, he commanded the Jews to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, in order to nullify the prophecy of Christ,—a plan which was brought to nought by divine interposition, as miraculous manifestations at two separate times interrupted the work begun with this impious motive.

In order to impart a new vitality to dying heathenism, the apostate bethought him of the following means:—

1. He endeavored to spiritualize polytheism by expounding the myths allegorically; by a greater solemnity in the ceremonial of worship; by more magnificent vestures for the priests; by the introduction of choral song and of preaching, after the example of the Church; but principally by the adoption of Christian verities and moral precepts for its regeneration.

2. With the same end in view, Julian exerted himself to elevate the priesthood by the institution of a kind of hierarchy, wherein chief-priests were appointed, the supreme head of whom was the emperor himself. He introduced "Litterae commendatitiae," a sort of penitential discipline and of excommunication, which he himself held suspended over some heathens. He laid down rules of proper conduct for the pagan priests in their behavior, with regard to domestic life, study, etc., which rules he took from the Christian canons. The zeal of this supreme priest in the service of the gods was by no means always acceptable to the other pagan priests, and sometimes excited them to ridicule and scorn.

3. Finally, Julian thought that the erection of benevolent institutions would be a very effectual means for the spreading of pagan worship, as his writings recommending this work plainly indicate.

Julian also commanded the rebuilding of the temples, the replacing of the idols in all the public places, and omitted no opportunity of making proselytes to paganism. This, indeed, did increase the number of apostates; but it in no way advanced the cause of paganism or injured that of the Church. This the emperor himself could not fail to perceive.

The ill-success which Julian met with in his conflict with Christianity excited his indignation against the Christians to a degree that carried him to the very verge of madness. He would assuredly have imitated the example of Diocletian, and have become a bitter persecutor, had not death freed the Church from this enemy. He fell in a battle against the Persians, in 363, after a reign of twenty months. When dying, he cried out, "O Galilean, thou hast conquered."¹

"It was but a little cloud that passed away" (*St. Athanasius*).

§ 43. *The Succeeding Emperors. — Gradual Extinction of Paganism.*

After the death of Julian paganism fell to pieces rapidly, in spite of the efforts of the Sophists. His successor Jovian (+ 364) declared himself decisively in favor of the Christians, yet he tolerated the pagan worship, and only prohibited the practice of magic. Valentinian I. (+ 375) and his brother Valens (+ 378) forbade the nocturnal sacrifices and magic, but recalled the prohibition as far as Greece was concerned. As for the rest, they were not harsh towards paganism. Under Valentinian paganism gradually disappeared from the cities, and became confined to the country places (hence, pagani, peasants). Gratian (+ 383), the successor of Valentinian, put away the dress, style, and title of Pontifex Maximus; he had the statue and altar of Victory removed from the Roman curia, or hall of the senate, withdrew their revenues from the temples, and deprived the Vestal virgins of their privileges, and of their support at the public expense. The remonstrances of the Roman embassy, whose speaker was the senator Symmachus, were without avail alike with Gratian as with his brother Valentinian II. (+ 392).

Theodosius the Great, who attained to the government of the East in 379, and afterwards (392-395) to that of the whole Roman Empire, was still more stringent in the measures he took against heathenism. His first edict prohibited apostasy, or a return to paganism; and another, of the year 381, forbade the sacrifice which was offered to foretell the future. He tolerated the public sacrifices in the larger cities, yet, in spite of the remonstrance of Libanius, did not prevent the often tumultuary destruction of those temples which he had ordered to be closed. Even the magnificent temple Serapeion,

¹ According to *Theod.* iii. 23.

together with the statue of Serapis, was destroyed, by order of the emperor, in 391.

Theodosius having become sole emperor, on the death of Valentinian II., after the defeat of Eugenius, who had tried to ascend the throne, Christianity became from that time forth the religion of the State.

The example set by the father was closely followed by his two sons, Arcadius (+ 408), who reigned in the East, and Honorius, who ruled the West. The succeeding emperors trod in their footsteps.

Heathenism, to which even yet a few families of the nobility and a portion of the mob were attached, was now, however, rapidly approaching its end. The Oracles had become dumb, and at the command of Stilicho the Sibylline books had been burnt. The hope that some zealous pagans had cherished, that Christianity¹ would perish in the year 399, had not been fulfilled; and about the middle of the fifth century paganism in the East numbered but few adherents, though it was not utterly extinct. In the West it kept its foothold longer, especially in country places.

But the extinction of heathen worship did not by any means imply the extinction of all superstition, some traces of which still remained, nay, may be said to remain to this very day; and the Catholic bishops of the fifth century strove in vain to mitigate the evil. It was not till the irruption of barbarians (commonly called the immigration of nations) overspread the empire and entirely broke up the Roman rule in the West, that the bishops, gaining another field for their labors, were enabled thoroughly to undermine the foundations on which the whole heathen structure was laid, and thus prepare a new ground for the operation of the Christian Church.

§ 44. *Polemics of the Pagans.*

The struggle of heathenism with the Church by no means ceased with the conversion of Constantine the Great; rather did it renew its zeal, and gather up all its forces to prolong the threatened existence of polytheism.

As before, this interesting warfare was carried on both in a direct

¹ There were prophecies current among the pagans that Christianity was fated to last only three hundred and sixty-five years; so, as they dated its existence from the death of Christ, this would make 399 the year of its destined dissolution. *Aug. Civ. Dei*, xviii. 53.

and in an indirect manner, and not so much by the priests of idolatry as by the rhetoricians and philosophers. The Neoplatonists took the most prominent part in it.

The books of Julian form the work of the greatest significance against the Church; in them Christianity is branded as a human invention, consisting of the worst elements of Judaism and heathenism. In one of his works Julian first endeavors to disprove the divine character and the inspiration of the Old Testament; and while extolling the glories of heathenism, he, like Celsus, attacks the divinity of Christ and of his religion, and heaps calumnies on the Christians, while he despises and ridicules their doctrines. Besides this work, which is but a fragment, we possess two smaller treatises of Julian, the "Cæsars" and the "Misopogon:" the first, which is a satire on Constantine the Great, ridicules baptism and penance; the latter, which is aimed at the people of Antioch, is mainly an insult to the Christian mode of living, with now and then a side blow at their religion.

The dialogue "Philopatris," the writer of which is unknown, has the same end in view. Like Lucian, its author attacks the dogmas of the Most Holy Trinity and of an overruling Providence, and decries the Christians as a peevish body of men, who are dangerous to the State.

Eunapius and Zosimus endeavored with all their might to excite the sentiment of patriotism against Christianity: they affirmed that the whole glory of the Roman Empire was intimately connected with the worship of the gods; that all the calamities that had befallen the empire might be ascribed to the neglect into which this worship had fallen; and that the continual decline of the empire itself was especially to be referred to this cause.

Among the principal objections raised against Christianity were those of the "late coming of Christ," and of the veneration of the martyrs, which last had already become a stumbling-block to the heathens; it was distorted by polemical writers, and used as a weapon against the Church.

Finally, in order to fill the people with abhorrence of the Christians, they were represented as being ignorant, intolerant, and melancholy. In order to animate the love of idolatry among the heathen, the Neoplatonists adopted many expedients, which they culled from Christianity itself. They were especially solicitous to vindicate the system of heathenism as a positive revelation of the gods; to supply by a collection of oracles, and of works written, as they pretended,

under the inspiration of the gods, an adequate equivalent for the Holy Scriptures ; and through these heathen reformers, who were presumably authorized and sent by the gods themselves, to present to the world men fully competent to act as apostles.

The imitation of Christianity becomes still more obvious in the doctrinal system of the Neoplatonists, who modified polytheism by accepting the doctrine of one supreme God presiding over good (angels) and evil (spirits). Further, they sought to establish the unity and universality of heathenism by teaching that subordinate gods watch over the welfare of individual nations, under the superintendence of the one supreme God ; and by giving an allegorical explanation of the myths they tried to remove the stumbling-blocks of polytheistic worship. Even in the doctrines respecting creation, Providence, and the worship of idols,¹ those of the philosophers who had a closer acquaintance with Christianity than others, approached nearer to the truth in what they taught.

The ethics of the Neoplatonists obviously disclose the attempt to adjust the morals taught by Christianity to their own views ; sometimes, indeed, they are literally borrowed from Holy Writ.

It was thus the Neoplatonists hoped to gain their end. They made no scruples about praising Christ as a most wise and pious man ; but this they did in order more fully to show up the folly of Christians in adoring him. Their efforts, however, were all fruitless ; they only went to prove the absolute nothingness of heathenism, which after this last glimmer rapidly disappeared.

The schools of Neoplatonism held out the longest. These were for many a preparatory training for Christianity ; they led others to syncretism. In Alexandria there was still such a school in 415, in which the female philosopher Hypatia met with a tragical end ; and in Athens, where amid many distinguished teachers Proclus (+ 485) stood prominent.

Justinian I. (529) at length closed also this school, and with it the last rays of heathenism disappeared. The expelled sought an asylum with Chosroes II. of Persia.

§ 45. *Christian Apologists.*

The objections and calumnies brought against the Church by their heathen adversaries induced many able Christian doctors to indite

¹ On the adoration of idols, see *Arnob.* *Adv. gentes.* i. 36. After they had been dedicated, the pagans believed them to be literally vivified by the gods. Julian, on the other hand, explained them to be visible symbols of the invisible gods.

apologies in order to prove the absolute nullity of polytheism and the overpowering greatness of the Christian religion.

Lactantius, in his "Institutiones divinae," refutes with ease and clearness paganism and its philosophy, and demonstrates the truth and sanctity of Christianity, both from the prophecies of the Old Testament, which were all fulfilled in Christ, and from the dogmas and moral teaching of the Church.

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, demonstrates, in his "Praeparatio evangelica," the necessity of rejecting the heathenish systems. He exposes with great erudition the folly of the myths of the gods, notwithstanding the allegorical interpretation given to them, shows the absurdity of the oracles, and in his "Demonstratio evangelica" lays down the distinction between Judaism and Christianity, the pre-eminence of which he explains.

The somewhat vehement epistle addressed to Constantius by Firmicus Maternus, "De errore profanarum religionum," is far from being so learned, and treats principally of the dark features of heathendom.

St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, in his "Oratio contra gentes," describes, in language at once eloquent and profound, the origin and effects of heathenism (apostasy from the true God), while he directs the attention of those heathens to the only remedy left them, that of returning to God. In his work "De incarnatione Verbi," this renowned father of the Church discourses on the congruity of the incarnation, on the appearance of the Logos in the flesh, and on the divinity of the Church.

Gregory of Nazianzen, and Cyril of Alexandria, wrote against Julian. The latter quotes the principal objections of the apostate emperor, word for word, in the treatise in which he refutes them.

The treatise of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, called "Curatio Graecarum affectionum," as also his "Consultationes Zachei Christiani et Apollonii philosophi," have the same object, namely, to set forth the sublimity and purity of Christianity in contrast with the degrading errors and superstitions of polytheism, whether in worship or philosophy.

The Spanish priest Orosius, by the advice of St. Augustine, wrote "Historia adversus Paganos," to prove that the calamities which afflicted the Roman Empire were not caused by the Christians.

The most imposing of all these apologetic works is the "Civitas Dei," of St. Augustine (written between 413 and 427). This work, which in the circle of its examinations comprises the most impor-

tant questions of philosophy, history, and theology, depicts with wonderful acumen the nonentity of heathenism, against the attacks of which the author triumphantly defends the divine character of Christianity. St. Augustine does full justice to the good natural qualities of the pagans, specially instanceing the civic virtues of the ancient Romans.

In the first (the apologetical and polemical) part of his great work (books i.-x.), he shows how baseless are the pagan complaints concerning the Christians, depicts the true causes of the decline of the ancient empire, and demonstrates the poverty and nothingness of pagan worship and philosophy.

In the second (the dogmatical and philosophical) part (books xi.-xxii.), he considers the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world, first in themselves, then in their growth and progress, finally in their termination, which involves the eternal happiness of the good, with the everlasting condemnation of the godless.

Salvian, a priest of Gaul, the Jeremias of his age (+ 484), wrote "De gubernatione mundi," an apologetic work, in which he repudiates the reproach cast by the heathen on the Christians, that the calamities overwhelming the Roman Empire are to be ascribed to the latter; at the same time he passes a severe judgment on the unbecoming conduct of many Christians.

§ 46. Relations of the State to the Church.—Influence of Christianity on Legislation.

The beneficial influence exercised by the Christian religion on the Roman Empire manifested itself in a special manner in the gradual Christianizing of the laws of the State. Constantine the Great was the first to begin this. He moderated certain judicial proceedings which were the most cruel. He abolished punishment by crucifixion, mutilation, branding, and the like; improved the condition of the prisons, and alleviated the lot of the prisoner.

Ecclesiastical festivals and Sundays were also acknowledged by the emperors, who forbade work, judicial proceedings, and public business on those days.

The beneficial influence of the Church on the power of the State is not less evident in the imperial edicts by which the gladiatorial combats, immoral theatricals, and unnatural lusts were strictly forbidden; though a considerable time elapsed before the Christian spirit penetrated all that was heathenish sufficiently to overrule it.

The mutual relationship of the wife to the husband and of the husband to the wife, of parents and children, were now also regulated on Christian principles. It was strictly forbidden to murder children, and the common practice of exposing the new-born infants was restrained as much as it was possible. The lot of slaves was ameliorated by special laws to that effect. The Church was empowered to set free such slaves as had a true vocation to the religious life, while the whole tenor of the teaching of the Church gradually led the way to the complete abolition of slavery.

Even though the precepts and principles of the Church regarding matrimony encountered great opposition on the part of the State, especially in the article of its indissolubility, the emperors nevertheless enacted laws restricting near relatives from marrying each other, as well as forbidding marriage between Jews and Christians. They also limited the grounds of divorce, while they prohibited adultery and violence under severe penalties. And, lastly, widows were, on the death of their husbands, permitted to assume their proper position in regard to their children and kinsfolk.

§ 47. Rights and Privileges of the Church.

Another consequence of the new position of the Church relatively to the State was that rights and privileges were conceded to her in course of time by the emperors, which extended to Church property, Church immunities, the political position of bishops, and the right of asylum.

Constantine the Great had already commanded the confiscated property of the Church to be restored, and had permitted free power of testating in her favor (321). He bestowed on the Church the goods of such martyrs as had died without heirs, and in their favor had abrogated the law against celibacy ("lex Julia et Papia Poppaea"), which was very prejudicial to the Church. He issued commands that in every province the public officers should provide a certain quantity of the necessaries of life for the maintenance of the clergy. The succeeding emperors, however, made many changes in these laws.

The right of administering and disposing of the Church property belonged to the bishop. In many churches an official administrator, a procurator (*oikóropos*), was appointed. The Council of Chalcedon (451) ordained that such should be appointed in every church. In the fifth century, and especially in the East, the State also took part in the administration of the revenues of the Church.

Under Constantine the Great, Church property had been exempted from taxation. Yet even during his reign—or perhaps later on, during that of his son's—a law was enacted compelling them to pay the ordinary taxes; still, however, exempting them from extraordinary exactions and the so-called low taxes ("munera sordida"). The imperial laws also exempted the clergy from personal tax.

In order to obviate the danger that persons might enter the clerical state from worldly motives, Constantine the Great decreed that decurions and especially that rich persons should not be admitted to the clerical state; that the vacancies should be supplied solely by ordaining priests to fill them.

Constantius abrogated this decree, which under certain circumstances might prove injurious to the Church, and on stipulated conditions permitted decurions to enter the clerical state. Under the succeeding emperors these arrangements underwent various modifications.

The political rights of the bishops, of which the emperors frequently availed themselves in important affairs of State, principally consisted in the right of publicly presenting letters of intercession in behalf of criminals already sentenced; of superintending the public prisons and benevolent institutions; of settling disputes among the clergy judicially, as also among the laity, if they, with their own consent, appealed to them for that purpose. The right of asylum had been transferred from the heathen temples to the Christian Church. Theodosius II. (437) extended the right of asylum to the environs of the churches.

One consequence ensuing from the intimate relation thus existing between Church and State was that offences against the Church, especially heresy, came to be considered as offences against civil society.

§ 48. Influence of the State on the Interior Condition of the Church.

In consequence of this close alliance between Church and State, the emperors laid claim to the exercise of a certain influence on the internal affairs of the Church. This influence was chiefly exerted in the position assumed by them at the synods, in the effects it produced at the election of the bishops, in the imperial edicts against heretics, and in introducing many articles of ecclesiastical discipline into civic legislation.

The first œcumenical councils were convoked by the emperors, who also appointed the places of meeting. This, however, was done either with the consent of the Popes or at their request.

In like manner the emperors were present, in person or by delegate, at the synods,—not to control the decisions of the bishops, but to manifest their reverence for the œcumenical councils and to maintain exterior order.¹

Likewise they ratified the resolutions passed by the council, not to render them valid, but to impart to them the sanction of the civil law of the State, by thus authorizing their being published and accepted as law of the land, the non-observance of which would subject the offender to civil punishment.

It was on account of the ecclesiastical and political position of the bishops, that Christian rulers desired to have a certain participation in the election of bishops, which said privilege not seldom was a restraint on ecclesiastical liberty.

The emperors declared heresy to be a civil crime, and enacted stringent laws against heretics, as disturbers of the peace, in order to prevent the falsification of truths revealed by God, and to preserve the unity of faith throughout the empire.

The bond of friendship which, since Constantine the Great, had united Church and State, might also become an oppressive fetter should the worldly power overstep its sphere. From being a powerful and respected protector of the Church, the political authority might be led to infringe on the inalienable rights of the Church. History furnishes us with more than one example of such an abuse. Several emperors went so far as to issue edicts promulgating articles of faith, to appoint and depose bishops at their own arbitrary will, and to make free consultation at the synod impossible. This violation of ecclesiastical principles was, however, rather the effect of an intemperate zeal on the part of the emperors than an attempt at formal usurpation. Theoretically, they still abided by the dictum of Constantine the Great. The bishops are appointed by God for the interior affairs of the Church (*ἐπίσκοποι τῶν εἰσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας*); but the emperor is, on the contrary, *ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἐκτός*, bishop of the outside.

This occasional misuse of imperial influence in ecclesiastical matters cannot be adduced in proof of the impropriety of combin-

¹ Βασιλεῖς δὲ πιστοὶ πρὸς εὐκοσμίαν ἔξηρχον (Ep. Chalc. ad Leon. pap. ap. Ballein. i. 1089).

ing the temporal with the religious interest; nor does it in any way testify that the Church consented to the State's disregard, in any one instance, of the superiority of the spiritual power. Independently of the high duty involved in it, it was of paramount importance to the interest of the State to promote the cause of the Church, whose mission it is to perfect the temporal and effect the eternal happiness of man. The abuses which took place in an alliance justifiable in itself and most beneficial to both parties never received the sanction of the Church, who through her representatives repeatedly protested against unjust encroachments. Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, Athanasius of Alexandria, Liberius of Rome, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose of Milan, St. Chrysostom, and others, were zealous champions of ecclesiastical liberty.

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 49. *Increase in the Number of Ecclesiastical Officers.—Education and Support of the Clergy.*

As the scope of episcopal activity increased, it became necessary to establish new ecclesiastical offices. The care of Church property devolved on administrators, or stewards (*oikónomoi*); and the defence of the rights of the Church, in case of lawsuits, was intrusted to pleaders (*ékdotikoi, sínthikoi*). Notaries (*δξυγράφοι*) drew up ecclesiastical docets, which were committed to the custody of the keeper of the archives (*χαρτοφύλακες*).

The bishop was represented at the imperial court by the advocates (*ἀποκρισιάριοι, responsales*). In the absence of the bishop the archpriests exercised every sacerdotal function that could be required of one consecrated to the service of God. One of the archdeacons presided over the administration of the temporal affairs of the diocese, represented the bishop at the synods, and for the most part became his successor. The syncelli (*σύγκελλοι*) were the advisers and domestic associates of the bishops. The hermeneuti (interpreters) explained the Holy Scriptures to the

people; the parabolani (*παραβολάνοι*) occupied themselves with the care of the sick; and the kopiatit (*κοπιάται*), or fossors, with burying the dead. On the other hand, the office of deaconesses gradually fell into disuse about this time, as also did the chor-episcopi in the East.

Many bishops transformed their dwellings into seminaries, in which candidates for the priesthood were brought up; and this, notwithstanding the existence of special theological institutions, and that the monasteries took a prominent part in the education of the clergy. These monasteries became schools no less famous for learning than for piety.

A cleric was usually ordained for some particular church. Ordination could not be repeated. Those who had belonged to an heretical sect or who had committed a great crime, those who were not personally free or who labored under any deformity of body, could not receive ordination.

At this epoch there were still many priests who lived either on their private property or from the labor of their own hands, although the voluntary contributions of the faithful, the legacies bequeathed to the Church, and the taxes, which from the time of Constantine the Great the congregations were compelled to pay for the support of the Church, were frequently applied to the maintenance of the clergy.

§ 50. *Celibacy.*

The obligation imposed on the higher ranks of the clergy to lead an unmarried life¹ is a primeval custom, not prescribed by any special law, but arising from the very spirit of Christianity itself; it is simply a following out² of the advice of Christ and of the Apostle Paul (Matt. xix. 10 sqq.; 1 Cor. vii. 32), whose words could most fitly be embraced and carried out in all their sublimity

¹ *Zuccaria*, Storia polemica del celibato sacro, Rom. 1775; and Nuova giustificazione del celib. sacro, Fuligno, 1785. *Roskovány*, Coelibatus et breviarium. Pesth, 5 vols.

² It is founded on the relation of the priest to God, — which Origen (Hom. 23, in Num.) gives in the following words: *Illiū est solius offerre sacrificium indesinens, qui indesinēti et perpetuae se devoverit castitati.* Cf. *Hieron.* Adv. Jovin. i. 34: *Sacerdoti, cui semper pro populo offerenda sunt sacrificia, semper orandum est: si semper orandum est, ergo semper earendum est matrimonio;* — and on his relation to the faithful, whose teacher, adviser, and father confessor the priest is. Concerning the high respect in which virginity is held by Christians, compare § 38.

by the clergy. The most ancient practice in the Church respecting this was:—

1. Those who were unmarried before entering the priesthood could not marry after doing so.

2. Those who had married previously to taking higher orders were allowed to continue in that state, though many abstained from matrimonial intercourse. Some synods in the Western Church imposed on all married clerics frequent abstinence from conjugal society.

3. Those who had been twice married were not admitted to holy orders¹ (1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 6).

The most ancient documents on this subject, which all presuppose clerical celibacy as an actually existing fact, are found in the writings of Tertullian² and Hippolytus. The latter reprimands Pope Callistus for permitting the clerics who had married to remain in the clerical state. Further, Eusebius³ cites writings of the Council of Antioch, held in the year 269, in which Paul of Samosata and his clergy are reproached for allowing women to dwell in their houses (*γυναικες συνεισπακτοι*), which is indirect testimony to their celibacy. Socrates cites the words of the holy Egyptian bishop Paphnutius, at the Council of Nice, with which he urges that it was an “ancient rule” that clerics of the higher ranks should remain unmarried. This accords with the twenty-seventh of the Apostolic Canons, in which only the lectors and chanters were allowed to marry.

It was not until abuses arose, and the rule of clerical celibacy was disregarded, that the Church enacted special laws to enforce the long-existing practice.

The councils held before that of Nice decreed, concerning celibacy, that no priest should marry.⁴ On the other hand, many bishops permitted marriage to their sub-deacons. The Synod of Aneyra (314) even gave permission to deacons to marry, provided they had the bishop’s consent so to do before ordination. There was no

¹ *Philos.* ix. 12, where Hippolytus blames Pope Callistus, because, under him, *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι δίγαμοι καὶ τρίγαμοι κατίστασθαι εἰς κλήρους.*

² *De exhort. cast.* c. 10. He adduces the following oracle of Priscilla: *Quod sanctus minister (the unmarried priest) sanetimoniam noverit ministrare, purificantia enim concordat, ait, et visiones vident, et ponentes faciem deorsum, etiam voces audiunt manifestas, tam salntares quam et occultas.*

³ *H. E.* vii. 30.

⁴ *Conc. Neocaes.* c. 1. *Πρεσβύτερος ἐὰν γῆμη τῆς τάξεως αὐτὸν μετατίθεσθαι, κτλ.*

uniform practice on this point among those of the higher clergy who were married before their ordination. The Council of Elvira (306) imposed on them the obligation of refraining from connubial intercourse.

The Fathers of the Council of Nice (325) desired to enforce the ordinance of the Synod of Elvira over the whole Church; but Sozrates¹ and Sozomenes relate that they yielded to the petition of the pious bishop Paphnutius, and allowed such of the higher rank of the clergy as were already married to retain their wives. The regulation passed in the third canon of the council against so-called spiritual sisters (*συνείσακτοι*) proves that a great number of the clergy were unmarried.²

After the Council of Nice, St. Cyril of Jerusalem,³ Epiphanius,⁴ and St. Jerome⁵ bear witness that in the fourth and fifth centuries, in the East as in the West, for the most part only unmarried priests were ordained. With respect to the clergy of high rank who had been married previous to their ordination, a double practice prevailed. In the East the marriage state was allowed to continue; whereas in the West the regulations of the Councils of Elvira and Arles had all the force of a law. The rule of celibacy in the West also included sub-deacons.

It is remarkable that the Trullan Synod, called the Quinisextum Synod (692), restricted the rule of celibacy to bishops, and allowed sub-deacons, deacons, and priests to marry once before ordination.

The Church of the West soon excelled that of the East by a far more faithful adherence to the sublime genius of the Christian priesthood. Highly as the Church esteemed virginity, she never forgot that matrimony was also a great sacrament. She therefore ever constantly defended the dignity and sanctity of marriage, and anathematized those who from an heretical point of view rejected this sacrament. For this reason the Council of Gangra put forth a canon which combated the false asceticism of Eustathius of Sebaste, while it in no way diminished the prerogatives of celibacy.

The assertion that Pope Siricius by his decrees introduced celibacy into Spain, Gaul, and Africa, is incorrect; for, in the first

¹ *Socr.* i. 11. *Sozom.* i. 23.

² Cf. *Nat. Alcx.* Saec. iv. diss. 19.

³ *Catech.* xii. c. 25.

⁴ *Haer.* lix. c. 4.

⁵ Ep. 48 (ad Pamachium). Episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi aut virgines eliguntur, aut vidui, aut certe post sacerdotium in aeternum pudici.

place, the information given by Himerius, Bishop of Taragon, to Pope Damasus, the predecessor of Siricius, presupposes the existence of the law of celibacy. Moreover, the Fathers at the Council of Carthage, held in 390, based this law on the doctrine of the apostles and the practice of the whole of antiquity; this, of course, could not refer to the decree of Siricius, which had been issued but five years previous.

§ 51. *Bishops, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs.*

By a decree of the Council of Nice, at least three bishops of the province should participate in the appointment of a new bishop; the consent of the other bishops of said province should be obtained, and the election should be confirmed by the metropolitan. The laity in the congregations lost by degrees their right of voting in episcopal elections, because they often misused their privileges.

The old ordinance that each diocese should have but one bishop was renewed at Nice. In case of old age or of sickness, the bishops were allowed a coadjutor. With the consent of the Metropolitan and the Provincial Synod, a bishop might divide his diocese. The translation of bishops from one see to another was forbidden by the canons.

The bishops were frequently admonished to visit their dioceses, to administer the sacrament of confirmation, to be present at the synods, and not to leave the episcopal city without reason, etc.

To each rural congregation (*παροικαί*) a priest was appointed by the bishop. The ordinance of Justinian, that such persons as had built and endowed a church with a permanent income, or their heirs, should have the right to present a worthy cleric to the bishop to fill this place, gave rise to what was afterwards called the right of patronage.

To the episcopal functions specially belonged ordination, or conferring orders and preaching. In the East priests gradually obtained permission to preach in the presence of the bishop; in the West St. Augustine was the first who enjoyed this privilege.

Special laws regulated the rights and duties of the metropolitan. He confirmed the election of his suffragans, and ordained them. He convoked and presided over provincial councils, received appeals, and exercised a judicial authority over the suffragans. In the East the political capital was also the ecclesiastical metropolis of the province. The synods of Antioch (341) and of Chaledon (451) laid

down the principle that the supreme direction of the ecclesiastical affairs of the province belonged of right to the bishop of the State's capital. In the West ecclesiastical provinces did not so much correspond to civil or political divisions.

The pre-eminent metropolitan authority was exercised by the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, who in the course of time received the titles of Archbishops, Exarchs, Patriarchs, and had several metropolitan provinces under their jurisdiction.

The Bishop of Rome possessed not only the primacy, but the patriarchal authority over the whole West, and not merely over the suburban provinces; the Patriarchate of Alexandria comprised Egypt, Lybia, and the Pentapolis. The Patriarch of Antioch exercised jurisdiction over Syria, Cilicia, Isauria, Osroëne, Mesopotamia, Phœnicia, and Arabia.

The Council of Nice (Canon VI.) confirmed the patriarchal rights of the bishops of Alexandria and of Antioch, referring to the rights patriarchal, not primatial, of the Bishop of Rome.

The same canon speaks of *Eparchies*, under which simple metropolitan sees can scarcely be signified. Such prominent metropolitan sees or exarchates were Ephesus for Asia Proconsularis, Cæsarea in Cappadocia for Pontus, Heraclea for Thrace, etc.

To the three ancient patriarchates were added, at a later date, two others, — the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and that of Constantinople.

After the Council of Nice, which in Canon VII. accorded certain honorable privileges to the bishops of Jerusalem, under reservation, however, of the rights of the Metropolitan of Cæsarea, the See of Jerusalem gradually arose to great distinction, until Bishop Juvenalis, whose first attempt at the Council of Ephesus had been ineffectual, succeeded in gaining patriarchal power over the three provinces of Palestine. The same council conceded patriarchal authority to the See of Constantinople.

Already at the Council of Constantinople (381) Canon III. had conferred on the bishop of this city, who had hitherto been subject to the Metropolitan of Heraclea, a precedence of honor ($\piρεσβέτα τῆς τιμῆς$), and had placed him next in rank to the Bishop of Rome, justifying the proceeding by the words, "Constantinople is a new Rome."

Although this canon did not in itself include the possession of any special privileges, and was not, in fact, ratified by the Pope, still the bishops of this capital city — partly from their political position, partly from their relation to the $\sigmaύνοδος ἐνδημούσα$ (i. e., the

synods held in their own city), and the steps they were often compelled to take relatively to the affairs of other sees, partly also by the exertions of the emperors — became practically invested with patriarchal rights even before the Council of Chalcedon.

The ninth and seventeenth canons of the Synod of Chalcedon permitted clerics and bishops to appeal from the bishop or metropolitan either to the exarch of the diocese, that is, to the chief metropolitan, or to the Bishop of Constantinople. The twenty-eighth canon of this synod accorded still greater rights to the Bishop of Constantinople, in that (1) It assigned and adjudged to the Bishop of New Rome, that he should possess equal privileges (*τὰ ισα πρεσβεῖα*) with the Bishop of Ancient Rome; (2) It decreed that the metropolitans of the provinces of Pontus, Asia Proconsularis, and Thrace, and the bishops of the countries occupied by barbarians, should be ordained by the Bishop of Constantinople.

The papal legate in whose absence the canon had been passed immediately protested against it; and Pope Leo the Great, whose primacy had been acknowledged alike by the emperor as by the Bishop of Constantinople, refused to ratify it,¹ that is, the canon. Nevertheless the Bishop of Constantinople continued to exercise the rights of a patriarch in these three provinces, and sought gradually to extend their dominion over the whole of the East. The Patriarch John IV. the Faster (582-595) even assumed the title of Ecumenical Patriarch,² when, at a synod in Constantinople (588), he was pronouncing a censure on the Patriarch Gregory of Antioch. Pelagius II. and Gregory the Great protested against the usurpation indicated by the title Ecumenical Patriarch, but could not induce the Bishop of Constantinople to lay it aside. At last the second Trullan Synod (692) adopted the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon as one acknowledged by it (thirty-sixth canon).

The patriarchs had the right (1) To confirm and ordain the metropolitans of their sees; (2) To receive appeals from them and from the provincial synods; (3) To convoke councils and preside over them; (4) To announce ecclesiastical laws, and see that they were observed.

In the West, at a later date, the title of Patriarch was conferred on some bishops as an honorary distinction, — “Patriarchae minores.”

¹ Ep. 104-107.

² This title was first conferred on Pope Leo the Great by the Council of Chalcedon.

§ 52. *The Primacy.*

As in the first centuries, so now at this epoch, the Popes of Rome stand prominently forth as the representatives and defenders of ecclesiastical unity. As years rolled on, their position became decided by the course of events. It was the condition of the Church itself that wrought out (so to speak) and established the reality of the papal supremacy in its importance and extent. When the unchangeable doctrine of the Church was beset by heresies, when her divine privileges were encroached upon by secular rulers, when the distinctive boundaries of respective hierarchical powers were infringed upon by over-assuming ecclesiastical dignitaries, as was too often the case, then it became a duty forced upon the Pope, as the supreme guide and teacher, to exercise the primatial power. This power, being in itself of divine institution, was by these causes called on to manifest itself, as is explicitly stated by the Fathers¹ of the Church, by the synods² and the emperors.³

¹ See *Kenrick's Primacy of the Apostolic See*. *Ballerini*, *De vi ac ratione primatus Rom. pontif.* p. 127 sqq. *Roskovany*, *Romanus Pontifex tanquam Primas ecclesiae*, i. p. 61 sqq. *The Chair of St. Peter*, by *Count Murphy*.

² At the Council of Ephesus (431), Philippus, one of the papal legates, thanked the synod, because "the holy members had united themselves to the holy Head, knowing well that Peter was the head of the faith in its entirety, and of all the apostles." At the same time the legates desired that the decrees already passed by the council should be laid before themselves, that they might confirm them as plenipotentiaries of the Pope; and this desire was complied with (*Harduin*, i. 1474). The Council of Chalcedon, when seeking confirmation of its decrees, addressed Pope Leo the Great in the following words: ὁν (of the bishops assembled in council), σὺ μὲν, ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν, ἡγεμόνεις ἐν τοῖς τὴν σὴν τάξιν ἐπέχουσι, τὴν εὐνοιαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος (Op. *Leon.* ed. *Ballerini*, i. 1089).

³ Concerning the endeavor of Constantius to induce Pope Liberius to acknowledge that St. Athanasius was rightfully deposed, Ammianus Marcellinus (*Hist. xv. 7*) says: Id enim ille, Athanasio semper infestus, licet sciret impletum, tamen auctoritate, qua potiores aeternae urbis episcopi, firmari desiderio nitebatur ardent. The Emperor Valentinian III. says (*Ep. ii. inter Leon.* ed. *Balleri*, i. 642): Cum sedis apostolicae primatum sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis corona, et Romanae dignitas civitatis, sacrae etiam synodi firmarit auctoritas, ne quid praeter auctoritatem sedis istius illicitum praesumptio attentare nitatur. Tunc enim demum ecclesiarum pax ubique servabitur, si rectorem suum agnoscet universitas.

In like manner, the Emperors Marcian — *Ep. ad Iconem* (*Ep. 110*) — and Justinian, who wrote to Pope John II.: Reddentes honorem apostolicae sedi et vestrae sanctitati . . . et ut decet patrem, honorantes vestram beatitudinem, omnia quae ad ecclesiarum statum pertinent, festinavimus ad notitiam deferre vestrae sanctitatis: quoniam semper nobis fuit magnum studium unitatem vestrae apostolicae sedis et statum sanctorum Dei ecclesiarum custodire, etc. Cf. *Cod. Just.* lib. i. tit. i. de summa Trinit.

“Whoever,” says St. Jerome, “is not in communion with the Church of Rome is outside of the Church.” By the words “Rome has spoken,” St. Augustine expresses, as he says himself, the universal conviction “that the judgment of Rome is the judgment of the Church.”

The bishops of a synod at Rome (503) peremptorily refused to “subject the head of the Church to be judged by his inferiors.” This universal authority of the Popes in the Church is attested by the imperial laws of Valentinian, Justinian, and others.

These and other testimonies on this point combine irresistibly to refute the assertion that the grandeur of the Roman Church or the political importance of Rome itself has elevated the Bishop of Rome to his high dignity.

A further proof of the ancient recognition of this primacy is the position that the Popes have ever held in the oecumenical councils.¹ These were convoked by their order or with their consent. Their legates presided over them, and the resolutions therein adopted were submitted to the Pope as to the final arbiter for confirmation or rejection.

There is no other way of explaining why frequent questions concerning the faith should be submitted to the Popes, and why it should be left to them to pronounce the rejection of heresies,² otherwise than by acknowledging their supreme power of teaching.³

¹ *Basil.* Ep. 70 ad Damasum. *Hieron.* Ep. 15 ad Damas. *Cyril.* *Alex.* Ep. ad Coelestimum, § 62. The synods of Carthage and Mileve to Innocent I. on the subject of Pelagianism. *Ballerini*, *De vi ac ratione*, p. 160.

² Celestine condemned Nestorianism; Leo the Great, the Monophysite errors. Innocent I. rejected Pelagianism.

³ *Theodoret* (Ep. 116) writes to the Roman presbyter Renatus: “Ἐχει γὰρ ὁ πανάγιος θρόνος ἐκεῖνος (scil. the Romish) τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησιῶν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν διὰ πολλὰ καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἀλλων ἀπάντων, ὅτι αἱρετικῆς μεμένηκε θυσιώδια ἀμύντος, καὶ οὐδεὶς τάναντια φρονῶν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἐκάθισεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν χάριν ἀκήρατον διεφύλαξε. St. Peter Chrysologus writes to the heretic Eutyches: *Beatus Petrus qui in propria sede vivit et praesidet, praestat quaerentibus fidei veritatem* (*Op. Leon.* ad *Ballerini*, i. 771). Pope Leo the Great writes (Ep. 5, c. 2): *Per omnes ecclesias cura nostra distenditur, exigente hoc a nobis Domino, qui apostolice dignitatis beatissimo Apostolo Petro primatum fidei sua remuneratione commisit*, universalem ecclesiam in fundamenti ipsius soliditate constituens, etc. The regula fidei of Pope Hormisdas (514-523), adopted by the Oriental bishops, is: *Prima salus est, regulam rectae fidei eustodire et a constitutis patrum nullatenus deviare*. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Jesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: *Tu es Petrus, etc., haec, quae dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in sede apostolica immaculata est semper servata religio. . . . Unde sicut praediximus, sequentes in omnibus apo-*

The supreme jurisdiction of the Popes is borne witness to by the papal decretals, which contained the answers to various questions on discipline, which answers had the force of law.¹ The first complete papal decretals which we possess are those of Pope Siricius (385-398); but it is an assured fact that the preceding Popes had already issued decretals.

This supremacy is also attested by the jurisdiction which the Bishops of Rome exercised over the patriarchs of the East. The confirmation of their election rested with them;² they sat in judgment on them³ if they were in fault, and if necessary even deposed them;⁴ while, on the other hand, no patriarch, no bishop, no council, ever ventured to judge the Pope.⁵

The Popes granted dispensation from the observance of ecclesiastical laws, whenever and wherever they thought it necessary or advisable so to do.⁶

A recognition of papal jurisdiction is likewise evidenced by the appeals made by patriarchs (Athanasius, Chrysostom, Flavian of

stolicam sedem et praedicantes ejus omnia constituta, spero, ut in una communione vobis cum, quam sedes apostolica praedicat, esse merear, in qua est integra et verax Christianae religionis soliditas. In the formula signed by John, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the year 519, it is said: *In sede apostolica inviolabilis semper catholica custoditur religio . . . in qua est integra Christianae religionis et perfecta soliditas.* Cf. Thiel. Epist. Rom. pontif. genuinae (a sc. Hilario), i. 795 and 852. Harduin, Acta conc. ii. 1016. Mansi, Act. conc. tom. xiii. Migne, Patr. lat. tom. lxiii. Hergenröther, Catholic Church and Christian State. Pope Adrian II. required the bishops who had taken part with Photius, to sign the enlarged formula of Hormisdas, which had been approved by the Eighth Ecumenical Council. Hard. v. 773.

¹ How frequently such questions (of discipline) were brought up before the Apostolic See is seen from Hieron. Ep. 123 (ad Ageruch.), c. 10: *Ante annos plurimos, quum in chartis ecclesiasticis iuvarem Damasum Romae urbis episcopum, et Orientis atque Occidentis consultationibus responderem, etc.*

² The Emperor Theodosius the Great applied to Rome to have the Patriarch Nectarius confirmed in the See of Constantinople; St. Chrysostom begged the same favor; Leo the Great confirmed the Patriarch Maximus of Antioch; etc.

³ See § 57 sqq.

⁴ Pope Celestine deposed Nestorius from his dignity. Pope Agapet deposed the Patriarch Anthimus of Constantinople, and appointed Mennas patriarch, in his stead.

⁵ When King Theodoric convened a synod to investigate the charges against Pope Symmachus, the bishops replied to him: *Nova res est; sedis istius Pontifice apud nos audiri nullum constat exemplum.*

⁶ Dispensations were granted by Pope Melchiades in regard to the Novatian bishops, and by Anastatius I. in regard to the Donatist bishops. Siricius (385-398) allowed some who had been uncanonically ordained to retain their functions, etc.

Constantinople) and by bishops (Theodoret of Cyrus), of the East, that the Pope might nullify and set aside the sentence pronounced against them.

The testimonies cited, which not only convince us of the primacy of the Popes, but of their many-sided activity in upholding the unity of the Church, receive additional confirmation from the conduct and expressions of the heretics of the period; for they were all desirous of winning over the Pope to their side.¹ Such were Nestorius, Eutyches, and others, who appealed to him from the decision of a synod, in order to obtain readmission into the Church, and restoration to the office from which they had been deposed.²

The Council of Sardica (343) makes special mention (Canons III., IV., V.) of the right of the Popes to receive appeals.

Canon XV. of the Council of Antioch (341), which has been adduced as disproving this said right, only forbids, in reference to Canon XIV., asking the votes of bishops of another province when the members of the provincial synod agree in their sentence against a guilty bishop. The appeal to Rome was not forbidden.

Nor does the conduct of the bishops of Africa disprove the right of the Pope to receive appeals. These forbade (393 and 418) the presbyters and clerics of inferior rank to make appeals beyond the sea; and, later on, they requested Pope Celestine I. not to receive appeals from presbyters, nor, until the ordinary judicial procedure had taken place, to receive them from bishops without grave reasons. The intention in this case was to obviate misusages, which created disturbances on trifling occasions. The African bishops continued thenceforward, as they had done heretofore, to appeal to Rome: as, for example, Antonius, Bishop of Fussala, appealed to Pope Innocent I.; Bishop Lupicinus, to Leo the Great; etc.

In virtue of their power as primates, the Popes repeatedly sent special legates into different dioceses, with the full power of regulating ecclesiastical affairs. At the Court of Constantinople they were represented by the Apocrisarii. In particular countries vicars were sent to take their place.

In conclusion, we have to remark that the Popes used to send the pallium to eminent bishops. Later on, it became the official dress of the metropolitans, who have to ask it from the papal chair.

¹ See §§ 57, 58.

² See §§ 62, 63.

Chronological Record of the Popes in the Second Period of the First Epoch.

When persecution had ceased, the chair of St. Peter became surrounded with exterior splendor, and its influence was developed more and more. Rome being no longer the imperial residence, her bishops manifested the most decided steadfastness in matters of faith, and rendered active assistance to all the oppressed. Then the fulness of power resting in the primacy, being less hindered from without, became more apparent from the fact that for the most part the men who occupied this chair were distinguished for excellence; even pagans, such as Ammianus Marcellinus, perfectly comprehended the significance of the earthly honors and possessions with which the veneration of the faithful for the dignity of its incumbents had endowed this primal seat of Christendom. But this same cause made the Apostolic See early become the target at which ambitious men took aim, and which gave occasion to temporal rulers to seek to gain an influence on the papal election.

After the longer pontificates of Sylvester I. (314-335) and of Julius (337-352), — the short pontificate of Marcus, from January to October, 336, coming between them, — Liberius (352-366) experienced severe oppression from the Arians, somewhat compensated for, however, by the faithful attachment of the Roman Christians. His successor, the Spaniard Damasus (366-384), had at first (366-367) a rival in Ursicinus; but the latter was banished by the emperor to Cologne, and Pope Damasus purified himself from the charges made against him by the Ursicinians at a Roman synod. This Pope issued decrees against the Macedonians and Apollinarians, confirmed the dogmatic decrees passed at Constantinople in 381, and strongly defended the rights of his supreme primacy. He attended to the preservation of the Catacombs of Rome, and while he prepared inscriptions for the tombs of the martyrs, he distinguished himself as a poet and as a learned man. St. Jerome for a long time acted as his secretary, and assisted him in answering the numerous questions addressed to him, as Pope, from all parts of the world.

Of his successor Siricius (384-398), who waged war against heresy in various shapes, we possess the first complete papal decrees.¹

The Popes Anastasius I. (398-402) and Innocent I. (402-417) were greatly celebrated, especially by St. Jerome. The latter energetically espoused the just cause of John Chrysostom, gave a dogmatic

¹ See §§ 50, 52.

decision against the Pelagians, and defended the rights of his chair in the matter of the more important affairs of the bishops ("causae majores"). When Alaric took Rome, he was at Ravenna, to which place he had gone, in the name of the Romans, to induce the Emperor Honorius to conclude peace with the Goths. His successor Zosimus, who reigned twenty-one months (417–418), issued the famous "Littera Tractoria" against Pelagius and Coelestius;¹ Boniface I. (418–422), to whom St. Augustine dedicated his work "against the two Pelagian letters," had at first a rival in the person of the archdeacon Eulalius, who was however exiled by the emperor for unlawful conduct. The decrees of Celestine I. (422–432) respecting the Semi-Pelagians and Nestorius were very important. Under him the contest with the Africans concerning the appeals to Rome, which had been begun under Zosimus in 418, was carried on and continued.² Celestine was succeeded by Sixtus III. (432–440), who exercised his right of dispensation with reference to the adherents of Nestorius, as Innocent I. had done with regard to those of Bonosus. The archbishops Eutherius of Tyana and Helladius of Tarsus, together with several prelates of the East, entertaining the same Nestorian views as the former, applied to him to revise the decrees of Ephesus, that he might save the world from the prevailing errors, even as Damasus had done in reference to Apollinarism. They esteemed the authority of the Apostolic See to be so high that they deemed the Pope able, of his own sole power, to overthrow entirely the decrees of the Council of Ephesus. The name of Great was acquired by the successor of Sixtus, Leo I. (440–461), a man of great learning,³ and of holy zeal for the Church, her faith and discipline.⁴

The Sardinian Hilarius, who had previously been (449) Leo's legate to Ephesus, during his pontificate (461–468) adjusted the ecclesiastical controversies in Gaul and Spain at the urgent request of the bishops, resisted the favoring of sects under the Emperor Anthemius, and in November, 465, held a synod with forty Italian, three Gallican, and two African bishops. Simplicius (468–483) and the succeeding Popes were occupied by the schism of Acacius.⁵ Hitherto the papal chair had been filled by free election; but King Odoacer now asserted that Pope Simplicius before his death had requested him, for the purpose of avoiding disturbances, to order that no Roman bishop should be consecrated without his

(the

¹ See § 61.

² See § 52.

³ See § 55.

⁴ See §§ 55, 63.

⁵ See § 63.

king's) consent. The Roman clergy resisted this ordinance, which impaired their freedom of election, and adhered to the regulation decreed by the Emperor Honorius at the request of Boniface I., by which only that person can be considered as the legitimate Roman bishop who is elected in canonical form, by divine judgment and the general consent. After this, Odoacer's decree was declared invalid because it lacked a papal signature, and also principally because the laity were not allowed to intermeddle in the affairs of the Roman Church. Thus the election of Felix III. (more properly II., 483-492) was free. Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, at first refrained from intermeddling in papal elections. The Roman Gelasius (492-496) opposed the arrogant pretensions of the Greeks, and issued many important decrees: he wrote against the Pelagians, Nestorians, and Monophysites, and found a splendid recognition in the Church. Dionysius Exiguus (Denys the Little) was his special panegyrist. But the Byzantine court now sought to influence the papal election. When Pope Anastasius II. (496-498) died, the senator Festus, who, at the instigation of the Emperor Anastasius, had been intent in gaining him over to sanction the "Henoticon,"¹ became solicitous to elevate Laurence to the papal dignity, as he was thought likely to favor that plan; but the majority of the clergy steadfastly adhered to the deacon they had elected, Pope Symmachus (498-514). The two parties were bitterly opposed to each other: it even came to bloodshed.

Meantime King Theodoric (499) acknowledged the lawfully elected Symmachus as Pope, and Symmachus conferred on his rival the bishopric of Nuceria. A Roman synod of March 1, 499, pronounced sentence of deposition against any cleric who during the lifetime of the Pope and without his knowledge sought to obtain votes for his successor, or who for that purpose should arrange meetings or hold consultations on the subject, or in any way form insidious designs to this end. The same synod decreed that in the event of the sudden death of the Pope, and in the absence of other regulations to meet the exigency, the person elected by the majority of the clergy should bear the palm of victory. But Festus and Probinus did not let the others rest. They accused Pope Symmachus of grievous crimes at the court of King Theodoric. The king therefore appointed Peter, Bishop of Altinum, as visitor to examine into the state of things at Rome; but Peter joined the schismatics. Many bishops doubted the lawfulness of the royal commission. Two synods

¹ See § 63.

remained ineffective. A fourth, in October, 501, recognized the innocence of the Pope, who had of his own free-will submitted himself to the judgment of this synod; and thus the rights of the Primacy were preserved.

Ennodius of Pavia defended this synod in a special treatise, and forcibly maintained the proposition, already expressed by Gelasius and other Popes, that no one was allowed to pass judgment on the Roman chair. Laurence was deposed and exiled; yet his party continued to hold together for some time longer.

A quiet pontificate was allotted to Hormisdas (514-523), who effected the restoration of ecclesiastical peace with Constantinople, and was on friendly terms with the imperial court at that place. John I. (523-526), his successor, fell into difficulties respecting the conflict between King Theodoric and the Emperor Justin in regard to the persecution of the Arians which broke out in the Eastern Empire. Theodoric, in 524, compelled the reluctant Pope to travel to Constantinople in behalf of his co-religionists. It was the first time that a bishop from ancient Rome had set foot in the eastern imperial city; the reception he met with on the part of the emperor and of the Patriarch Epiphanius was gorgeous in the extreme. On Easter day (March 30, 525) John celebrated the solemn services according to the Latin rite, for which purpose a throne was erected for him, higher than that of Epiphanius, as symbolical of the higher power of the Pope. As John, however, could not and would not entirely fulfil the wishes of Theodoric, he was, on his return to Ravenna, cast into prison by command of the Arian ruler, and died there May 18, 525. Theodoric, who was also enraged against Boethius, succeeded in procuring the election of the cardinal priest of St. Sylvester, Felix IV. (more properly III., 526-530). Boniface II. (530-532) was for a time resisted by Dioscurus, the anti-Pope; he gave a decisive judgment against the Semi-Pelagians, and in 531 held a synod for the purpose of upholding his patriarchal rights. John II. (532-535) was on good terms with the imperial court. Agapetus I. (535-536), who had personally exercised his supreme power of jurisdiction at Constantinople, died there. Sylverius (536-540)¹ was elected at Rome through the influence of Theodatus; neither he nor Theodoric had appealed to the law of Odoacer, and Attalaric simply imposed a tax on the contending parties in case they brought the matter before the courts.

The Greek domination in Italy after the victories of Belisarius

¹ See § 63.

was much more dangerous to the independence of the Apostolic See. This was especially shown by the pontificate of Vigilius (540–555), who owed his elevation to the Greek court.¹ Justinian demanded that the imperial confirmation should be applied for, and introduced a sort of tax, which the Popes were to pay to the imperial court at their elevation. This tax was abolished by Constantine Pogonatus under Pope Agatho, and under Benedict II. the immediate consecration of the pontiff elect was permitted; and the act of election alone was to be communicated to the court or to the exarch. The exarch who came to Rome at the election of Sergius I. (687) had no power to render valid any act of confirmation he might perform. But now the independence of the papacy was threatened from another quarter. Under John III. (560–573), who had succeeded Pelagius I. (555–560), the Longobards, partly Arians, partly Pagans as yet, invaded Italy, and founded a dominion which they continually strove to extend; they treated the inhabitants much more harshly than the Ostrogoths had done. This placed John III. (560–573), Benedict I. (574–578), and Pelagius II. (578–590) in a very difficult position, especially as the strife concerning the three chapters was still pending: it was a period of great social distress.

The pontificate of Gregory the Great (590–604) presents one of the most imposing features in the history of the Church. He adopted the title “servus servorum,” which his successors have retained.² The immediate successors of Gregory, who like himself had been deacons and were well versed in the affairs of government, reigned but a short time. They were Sabinian (604–606) and Boniface III. (+ 607). In 609 Boniface IV. (608–615), with the consent of the Emperor Phocas, dedicated the pagan temple of the Pantheon at Rome, for a church of all saints. Deusdedit, or Adeodatus (615–618), and Boniface V. (619–625) were succeeded by Honorius I. (625–638), a native of Campania. He was pious and modest, solicitous for the spread of the faith, zealous for the ornamentation of churches, but not able to contend with the astuteness of the Greeks.³ It was necessary for him also to exercise his temporal power. He appointed two governors at Naples, to whom he gave instructions in administration. The succeeding Popes — Severin (+ 640), a Roman; John IV., formerly a deacon (640–642); Theodore, a Greek from Jerusalem (+ May, 649); St. Martin of Lodi (649–655) — are of blessed memory on account of their conflict with the Monothelites. Yet even during the lifetime of Martin (654),

¹ See § 63.

² See §§ 51, 64, 68, 79, and, above all, § 98.

³ See § 65.

Eugene I. was elected by the Romans to prevent the emperor from forcing a heretic upon them. In his imprisonment Martin himself (655) gave his consent to this after the deed was done. Eugene died shortly after (657). The reign of Vitalian (657-672) was of longer duration. He tried every mild measure within his power to conciliate the Greek court; and at a synod he declared in favor of John, Bishop of Lampa, who in 667 had been uncanonically deposed by Paul, Archbishop of Crete. The reigns of Adeodatus II. (672-676) and of Domnus, or Donus (676-678), were short; the latter was succeeded by St. Agatho (678-681), under whom the Sixth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople (680) was held.

The sublime dignity of the Roman bishop as the successor of St. Peter was recognized more and more both by the emperors and the bishops. Though other titles in common with those attributed to the Pope might be held by other bishops, no one was called, as he was, "Father of Fathers;" no one was named "Head of all;" or "Head of all churches;" no chair was called the "Rock," the "Rock of Faith;" to no other bishop was confided, as it was to him of Rome, the pastoral care over the whole earth.

The solicitude of the bishops of Rome was not even confined to the spiritual welfare of Christians; they were everywhere known by their paternal love for the distressed members of the Church and for the services they rendered them. The early writers bear witness to this by their eulogies. These exterior beneficent labors of the Popes were still more called into action when the inhabitants of their own land (Italy) suffered such great hardships from foreign invaders at the time it was almost forsaken by the Eastern emperors, who had neither the power nor good-will to render efficient aid to protect Italy, while they still laid claim to it as forming part of their dominions. It was then that the Popes exercised a great and beneficial influence, and became also the defenders of the political interests of the Roman people. In the hard position in which they found themselves after the time of Agatho, they finally turned their eyes to the West, whence they desired the help which they did actually receive.

Divine Providence at that time so shaped the course of events that the Vicar of Christ became a temporal sovereign, in order that, freed from the yoke of despotic rulers, he should be the better enabled to exercise his apostolic office for the whole Church, spread throughout the world.

The development of these things will be seen in the next epoch.

§ 53. *Ecumenical Councils.*

The freedom of action which the Church enjoyed from the time of the conversion of Constantine the Great greatly facilitated the intercourse between her teachers and guardians. When, therefore, the circumstances of the times, especially the assumptions of heresy, demanded the voice of the Church, the bishops met more frequently together in council to decide on the matters which required their attention.

According to the intention with which the synods were convoked, and the number of members in attendance, synods were divided into universal or ecumenical councils; general synods; patriarchal, national, and primatial councils; and into provincial and diocesan synods.

A peculiar kind of synods were the permanent synods (*σύνεδροι ἐδημοῦται*) in Constantinople, which were presided over by the patriarch and attended by such bishops as happened to be in the imperial city (*ἐρδημοῦτες*).

An ecumenical council did not require the presence of all the bishops; it sufficed that representatives of all ecclesiastical provinces, or all bishops, should be invited, and that a considerable number of them from the different Christian countries should be present.¹ As a general rule, the council was convoked with at least the *consent* of the Pope, who presided over it by his legates.

The first eight ecumenical councils were convoked by order of the emperors, with the consent of the Popes. The invitation was generally addressed to the metropolitans only, who then notified their suffragans. The bishops who could not themselves attend were allowed to send representatives.

The Pope presided² at the ecumenical synod, if not in person, then by his legate or by some distinguished bishop whom he designated as his representative.

The decrees of an ecumenical council were not valid, had no legal force as the decrees of a universal council, before the papal approbation had been asked and granted.³

¹ Cf. *Pelag. Pap.* Ep. 6 ad Orient.: *Cum generalium synodorum convocandi auctoritas Apostolicae sedi beati Petri singulari privilegio sit tradita, et nulla unquam synodus rata legatur, quae apostolica auctoritate non fuerit fulta.*

² *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils.

³ Pope Julian declared to the Eusebians that it was against the ecclesiastical rule, *παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου "Πωμης κανονίζειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας* (Socr. ii. 17). The

No council which was not ratified by the Pope was ever recognized as oecumenical. On the other hand, a council not previously oecumenical became so when it subsequently received the approval of the Apostolic See.¹ This was the case with the first Council of Constantinople (381), which received oecumenical authority by a subsequent approbation of the Sovereign Pontiff.

The rank or precedence accorded to the bishops at the synods was regulated in some countries—as, for example, in Africa—by the length of time that had elapsed since their ordination; in others, it was based on the relative importance of their respective sees. Those priests who represented absent bishops took the places of those whose delegates they were, and signed as bishops did, ὅρισας ἐπέγραψα. In voting, each member had a vote. An exception to this rule was made at the Council of Constance (see § 127) and of Basle (§ 128). The subjects which were to be discussed were decided on at the sessions themselves.

Beside decrees concerning faith, the oecumenical and particular synods also issued various precepts of discipline.

In the East, John Scholasticus, Patriarch of Constantinople since the year 564, collected and arranged the laws of the Church in a systematic form, under fifty titles, after the model of the Justinian Code. The “Nomocanon,” whose author is unknown, adds thereunto the corresponding imperial laws. In the West, the “Prisca translatio,” also called “Prisca,” was completed by Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian monk. To the collection already made of the first fifty of the Apostolic Canons, and the decrees of different councils, he added the decretals of the Popes from Siricius to Anastasius II. (+ 498).

The Isidorean Collection, erroneously attributed to Isidore, Bishop of Seville, was made at the beginning of the ninth century.

The African Church also had a collection of its own.

Council of Chalcedon expressly asks for the papal confirmation, remarking, πᾶσαν ὑμᾶν τῶν πεπραγμένων τὴν δύναμιν ἐγνωρίσαμεν εἰς σύστασιν ἡμετέραν καὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν πεπραγμένων βεβαιώσιν τε καὶ συγκατάθεσιν. The Emperor Marcian and Patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople also addressed writings to Rome with this purpose. Cf. *Gelas.* i. Pap. de anathemat. vinculo. Totum in sedis Apostolicae positum est potestate. Itaque quod firmavit in synodo (scil. Chalc.) sedes Apostolica, hoc robur obtinuit, quod refutavit, habere non potuit firmitatem, et sola rescindit, quod praeter ordinem congregatio synodica putaverat usurpandum.

¹ For proofs respecting the faith of the Church in the infallibility of the Church, gathered from Scripture and tradition, see *Bellarmin*, *De conciliis*, ii. 2 sqq.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 54. *The Oriental Fathers.*

THE most flourishing time of patristic literature was in the fourth and fifth centuries, which gave birth to those acute, learned, and spiritual men whose works are specially valuable, not only from the depth of thought which they exhibit, but also from their attractive form.¹

The impulse given to this scientific activity, which encompassed the entire sphere of theology, was the effect of the various circumstances of the time. In the first place, it was the attacks made on Christianity by pagans, heretics, and schismatics which gave rise to apologetic and dogmatical treatises. But the endeavor to expound to Christian people the true signification of the Holy Scriptures, and to awaken within them the true spirit of piety, brought forth many exegetical and ascetic writings more or less extensive in their scope.

Then the departments of Church history and of Church discipline were by no means neglected; and some Fathers undertook to make a systematic arrangement of the doctrines of faith, although Origen had failed in his attempt to do this.

The monastic life became, at this era, of paramount importance for the development of Christian knowledge; for the greatest doctors of the Church came forth from the cloisters, where in solitude and retirement they had acquired such a conception of the sublime truths of Christianity as fitted them to demonstrate these to the world, and to defend them against all rationalistic disfigurements.

In the East speculative theology was principally in vogue, while in the West the practical method prevailed; this was chiefly occasioned by the character of the heresies that sprung up here and there. The Orientals mostly wrote in the Greek language, while the Western Catholics made use of the Latin.

Besides theology, philosophical branches, jurisprudence, and other sciences were treated of by Christian doctors; and some poetical compositions of Fathers of this epoch have challenged the admiration of posterity.

To the most celebrated schools of learning belonged the catechetical school of Alexandria and the exegetical school of Antioch,

¹ See *Fessler*, Inst. patrol. 1850.

founded by the presbyters Dorotheus (+ about 290), and Lucian (+ 311, towards the close of the third century). The school of Alexandria, imbued with the spirit of Origen without defending his errors, chiefly adopted a speculative, mystical mode of laying hold of the truths of faith, and with some modifications retained the allegorical manner of interpretation used by their master. The Antiochian school, the rival of the Alexandrian, took the contrary view, opposed the allegorizing method by an historically grammatical explanation of the Scriptures, and inclined to a more sober, more one-sided view, leading to an intellectual narrowness which under Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus (+ about 390), and under Theodore, who, later on, was Bishop of Mopsuestia (+ 428), degenerated into rationalism.

Less important, but not unrenowned, were the schools of Edessa and Nisibis, in East Syria, and of Rhinocorura, in Palestine.

“This epoch of the Fathers of the Church” was but too quickly followed by a time in which ecclesiastical science declined, — a time in which nothing new was produced, and in which it was with difficulty that the former status was kept up at all. This literary sterility was doubtless owing in a measure to the devastations of Islam in the East, and of the German tribes in Italy, Spain, and Africa; but scarcely less so to the oppressive despotism exercised by the Byzantine Emperors in spiritual matters, to which the Monophysite sects contributed not a little.

As it was the lot of many of the Fathers of the Church, to be intimately connected with the history of heresies, all that we now propose to do is to give sketches of the lives of those writers which may be considered of interest apart from these doctrinal controversies.

Among the Alexandrians, besides Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea¹ (+ 338), St. Athanasius² and the three great Cappadocians occupy prominent places. The first of these is St. Basil the Great, born at Cæsarea about 330, who received his scholastic training in the colleges of Cæsarea, Constantinople, and Athens. After receiving baptism he visited the monasteries of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. He then withdrew into solitude, where, with his friend Gregory of Nazianzen, he devoted himself to study (*φιλοκαλία*) and to ascetic exercises.

In the year 364 Basil was ordained priest by Bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea, and intrusted with the office of preaching. Meanwhile various reasons induced him to retire to his monastery, which, how-

¹ See §§ 2, 45, 57.

² See §§ 57-59.

ever, he was soon compelled to leave in order to assist his bishop in his conflict with the Arians. After the death of Eusebius, Basil became Metropolitan of Cæsarea, and as such he chiefly bestirred himself to preserve unity among the bishops, to renew the religious spirit by promoting monasticism, and to become a true shepherd to the flock of his diocese (+ 379).

The most important writings of this steadfast bishop are the five books against Eunomius, the work "De Spiritu Saneto," several homilies, which are accounted masterpieces of Greek eloquence, together with several ascetic treatises, and a collection of three hundred and sixty-six letters, containing information of great historical importance to the criticism of that time.

As much renowned as Basil, is his "spiritual brother," St. Gregory of Nazianzen, the theologian. Born in the year 329 at Arians, he received a religious education from his pious mother, Nonna, and was instructed in the sciences in the schools of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia and Palestine, Alexandria and Athens. Julian the Apostate sought the friendship of Sts. Gregory and Basil. In the year 356 Gregory returned to Nazianzen, received holy baptism, and in the year 358 withdrew to the monastery of St. Basil. But he was soon recalled to assist his father, who, after his conversion, had become Bishop of Nazianzen.

After a long resistance Gregory was ordained priest in 361, and appointed Bishop of Sasima (372) by St. Basil; but he resigned this bishopric and became coadjutor to his father, who was now much advanced in years (+ 374), till at length the government of the Church of Constantinople was committed to his charge.

The condition of religion in the city was at that time very discouraging; but the zealous bishop succeeded in strengthening the Catholics in their faith and in converting many heretics, so that the Church there celebrated a veritable resurrection. Gregory had to encounter violent demonstrations of hostility from the Arians. The cynic Maximus, a hypocrite and intriguer, also caused him much suffering. Theodosius the Great, with the consent of the members of the Council of Constantinople, in 381 elevated Gregory to the episcopacy of the city. The objections raised against his election by the Egyptian bishops, who afterwards came to the council, induced him to abdicate his dignity and to return to his native place, where he died in 389 or 391.

The principal work of Gregory consists of his five discourses "on Theology." Besides this, we possess valuable apologetic works of

his (two discourses against the Emperor Julian), his "Oratio de fuga," homilies, letters, and poems.

The third great Cappadocian was St. Gregory of Nyssa, brother of St. Basil. First of all, he was professor of rhetoric; then, in 371, he became Bishop of Nyssa. Driven from his residence in 375 by the intrigues of the Arians, Gregory for a long time flitted from place to place, and it was not till the year 378 that he was enabled to return to his flock. He was very active at the Council of Constantinople, 381. The year of his death is uncertain.

The writings of this stringent moralist are of no small importance for theology. In his expositions of Scripture he for the most part follows Origen, without, however, adopting his errors.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, born in 315, was a contemporary of St. Gregory. He was ordained by Bishop Maximus, acted for a time as catechist and preacher in Jerusalem, and in 351 ascended the episcopal throne of that city. He was calumniated and persecuted by the Arians, especially by Acacius, Bishop of Caesarea, and the Emperor Valens. He spent sixteen years in exile, and it was not till the death of Valens (+ 386) that he was able to return to his bishopric. His principal work consists of twenty-three catechetical treatises, besides which we possess an interesting letter to the Emperor Constantius.

Didymus the Blind, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, the triumphant victor in the conflict with Nestorian rationalism, also belong to the Alexandrine school.

Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa (+ 360), and Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, belonged to the school of Antioch, of which school St. John Chrysostom, born at Antioch in 347, was so distinguished an ornament. St. John Chrysostom was first a lawyer, then labored as priest in his native city until the Emperor Arcadius, in 397, elevated him to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The frankness with which the great preacher censured the loose morality of the capital city, nay, of the imperial court itself, drew upon him the enmity of the Empress Eudoxia, of the Eunuch Eutropius, and other men of high standing, who waited but the opportunity to ruin the zealous bishop. Such an opportunity presented itself in the controversies respecting the doctrines of Origen.

The violent patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria went to Constantinople, associated himself with the adversaries of Chrysostom, and in 403, at the pseudo-synod "at the Oak" (*ἐπὶ δρῦν*, "ad quercum").

pronounced his deposition, on which the Emperor Arcadius sent him into exile.

In consequence of some terrible natural phenomena, and of a commotion among the discontented people, the misguided emperor became uneasy and recalled the faithful pastor, but only at a somewhat later period to send him back into exile. A so-called synod deposed him a second time in the year following, and at the instance of the empress he was banished. The steadfast bishop first tarried at Nice, then in Cucusus. He did not reach the place of his exile, Pityus, on the Black Sea; he died on the road thither (407).

We possess various exegetical works of Chrysostom, in which the defects of both schools, that of Alexandria and that of Antioch, are happily avoided. Besides these, we have many most valuable sermons, several dogmatico-polemical works, ascetic treatises, letters, etc.

St. Ephraem the Syrian (+ after the year 379) is renowned as an exegetic expounder, a preacher, and an author of numerous hymns. He, "the prophet and the lyre of the Holy Ghost," lived as an anchorite in the vicinity of Nisibis, and became, later on, a deacon (probably a priest) at the Church of Edessa. He was a very prolific writer, who triumphantly defended the Catholic doctrine against the numerous heretics of Syria, and by his ascetic works became an authority of importance for the religious life. Only a part of his writings have been preserved.

St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis (+ 403) in Cyprus, was an ardent opponent of heresy. He was less critical than learned. His principal work is that in which he collects together eighty different errors, which he confutes.

Synesius of Cyrene, a pupil of the unfortunate Hypatia, who afterwards became a Christian and the Bishop of Ptolemais (+ 414), was a steadfast defender of the Church, and a renowned writer. His works, however, retain echoes of the Neoplatonic philosophy.

§ 55. *The Fathers of the West.*

One of the most celebrated Fathers of the Latin Church was St. Hilary of Poitiers, "the Athanasius of the West." He was already of mature age when he entered the Church, and in 354 he became bishop of his native city. The freedom of speech with which he opposed the Roman Emperor Constantius caused his banishment to Phrygia (356); but even in exile he fought against

heresy by word and writing; by letters, too, he guided his flock during his banishment. He was restored to them in 360. Then it became his principal care to reconcile the Semi-Arians to the Church; and in this he partially succeeded.

The most important writings of St. Hilary are his twelve books "De Trinitate," his book "De synodis seu de fide Orientalium," two books against Constantius, commentaries on the Holy Scripture, etc.

A worthy contemporary of St. Hilary is St. Ambrose, born at Treves (340) and brought up at Rome. From the year 370 he held the office of Prefect of Liguria and Æmilia. Though as yet but a catechumen, he was in the year 374 elected Archbishop of Milan by acclamation. In spite of the intrigues of the Empress Justina, Ambrose successfully combated the Arians, and baffled the designs of the heathen senator, Symmachus.

In the interest of Valentinian, he twice undertook an embassy to the usurper Maximus, whom he compelled to do penance for the murder of Gratian. Theodosius the Great was also obliged to perform public penance in Milan on account of the slaughter in Thessalonica (390). The conversion of St. Augustine is to a great extent attributable to St. Ambrose.

The most important works of St. Ambrose, who in many respects followed the standard of the Greek Fathers, are his moral treatises. As an expounder he principally favored the allegorico-typical method. This bishop, so zealous and so ardent for the due celebration of divine worship, yet acquired his greatest fame by his preaching. Several also of his polemico-dogmatical works have come down to us, with ninety-two letters and some hymns. On the other hand, the commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, the so-called "Ambrosiaster," is not from his pen.

St. Jerome, born at Stridon in Dalmatia in 331, is distinguished for his great knowledge of classic and Oriental literature. After having completed his studies at Rome, he stayed for a short time at Treves, Aquileia (Rufinus), and in his native city. He then, in the year 372, travelled to the East, that in the desert of Chaleis he might devote himself to the pursuit of knowledge and to exercises of piety. Having been expelled from the desert by the Meletian controversies, Jerome betook himself to Antioch, and was ordained priest by Bishop Paulin. Thence he travelled (380) to Constantinople, to visit St. Gregory Nazianzen; and from Constantinople he went to Rome, where he assisted Pope Damasus in his numerous labors, and won over many of the laity, especially women, to the

ascetic life. After the death of his protector (385), Jerome left Rome; and for the remainder of his life, during which he was often persecuted by the Pelagians, he remained at Bethlehem, where he died, Sept. 30, 420.

If St. Jerome, who sometimes comported himself in an antagonistic manner even toward St. Augustine, and who exchanged disputatious letters of considerable bitterness with his friend Rufinus, comes before us in a somewhat harsh manner in his polemic writings, the cause of this must be ascribed, not to pride and haughtiness, but to his ardent temperament, which was combined with an interior depth of piety; he was, moreover, often provoked by the character and conduct of his adversaries. It would likewise be unfair to judge him by his polemic works alone; his other works, especially his letters, must be taken into account.

Jerome was undoubtedly one of the most learned of the Fathers of the Church, as his numerous works, whether original or translations, prove, by their contents and the perfection of the style in which they are written. His translation of Holy Scripture into Latin has been universally adopted in the Church ("Vulgata"). Very valuable are his commentaries on many books of Holy Writ. Of great importance are also his ascetic writings and historical works; also his polemic treatises and the letters in which he gives desirable information concerning the occurrences of the day.

Rufinus of Aquileia (+ 410), who was at first the friend, then the opponent, of St. Jerome, also spent many years in the monasteries of Egypt and Palestine; but, later on, he returned to Rome, and became known as an admirer of Origen, whose opinions, even those which were erroneous, he endeavored to defend.

Rufinus is more distinguished by his translations from Greek works than for original compositions, and even in these his merits are greatly diminished by the arbitrary and inaccurate manner with which he performed his task.

The first place among the Fathers of the Church undoubtedly belongs to St. Augustine, who in his "Confessions" has given us an incomparable description of his own life. He was born at Tagaste, in Numidia (354), and received his scientific education at the schools of Madaura and Carthage, where, notwithstanding the admonitions of his pious mother, St. Monica, he deviated from the path of virtue. He opened a school for rhetorics at Carthage. The love of more serious studies having been excited within him by reading Cicero's "Hortensius," he endeavored to satiate his thirst for

knowledge by joining the Manichæans. Intercourse with Faustus, however, convinced him of the absurdity of the doctrines taught by this sect. He then, being twenty-nine years old, united with the sceptical academy at Rome; dissatisfied with this, he, in the year 384, obtained a professorial chair of eloquence in Milan, and directed his attention to the study of the Platonic philosophy. Impelled by a happy curiosity, he was led to attend the sermons of St. Ambrose, which impressed him with a great reverence for Christianity, to the doctrines of which he had hitherto given but little attention. His conversion was completed by personal intercourse with the bishop himself, by the study of the Holy Scriptures, in which he was encouraged by the priest Simpleian, and by the tears and prayers of his mother, who had followed him to Milan.

Convinced of the truth of Christianity, Augustine followed at once the call of divine grace. After a somewhat lengthened period of preparation, he received baptism at the hands of St. Ambrose, together with his son Adeodatus and his friend Alypius (387). Monica died at Ostia, as she was returning to Africa. Whereupon her son remained a year longer at Rome, and then returned to his native place, where, in 391, he was ordained priest by Valerius, Bishop of Hippo Regius, whose successor he became in 396 (+430).

This genial doctor of the Church, who was loved and reverenced by every one, lived at a time when the Church met with much opposition, which he triumphantly overcame. His principal work is the "City of God," a philosophy of history, remarkable for the profound speculation and great erudition displayed by its author.¹ Among his dogmatical works, the "Enehiridion," which is a discussion of the most necessary doctrines, holds a prominent place. Against the pharisaic Donatists he explains at large the doctrines regarding the nature of the Church.² He manifests the superiority of his genius in his defence of the fundamental truths of Christianity against the Manichæan³ and Priscillianistic⁴ heresies. Arianism he combated in fifteen books on the Trinity. To the erroneous views of Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism,⁵ he opposed those perpetual monuments of the Catholic doctrines on grace and predestination which won for him the title "Doctor Gratiae."

For the instruction of catechumens, he composed the work "De catechizandis rudibus."

Further, the philosophical, exegetical, moral, and ascetic writings of this celebrated bishop, as well as the two hundred and eighteen

¹ See § 45.

² See § 56.

³ See § 28.

⁴ See § 60.

⁵ See § 61.

letters yet extant, bear witness to his extensive learning, to the acute penetration with which his spirit was endowed, as well as to his fervent interior piety.

Pope Leo the Great (+461), in a time of extreme embarrassment and of ecclesiastical disorder, proved himself a zealous and efficient pastor. Twice he saved Italy and Rome from destruction. His majestic deportment inspired Attila (452) and Genseric (455) with such reverence that it calmed their fury and turned aside their weapons of devastation.

He maintained the rights of the Apostolic See, defended the purity of the faith against the Manicheans, Priscillianists, and Eutychians, and acquired the reputation of a great preacher by ninety-six sermons excellent for their solidity. The works he has left us are as remarkable for their originality and theological learning as for the beauty and grace of their style.

2. HERESIES AND SCHISMS.

§ 56. *The Donatist Schism. — Schism of Meletius.*

The heresy of the Donatists presents a great similarity to the false principles of the Novatians, and to those of the opponents of baptism conferred by heretics. The schism “owes its origin to the anger of an offended woman; it was nourished by ambition, and strengthened by avarice.”

Already, at the Provincial Synod of Cirta in Numidia (305), under Secundus of Tigisis, erroneous views respecting the *Traditores*¹ were uttered; but though these were followed up by some controversies under the energetic archbishop Mensurius, at Carthage, the peace of the Church was not as yet disturbed.

After his death, however, the disputations originating in Cirta broke out. Lucilla, a wealthy Spanish lady, placed herself at the head of a party who opposed the election of the Archdeacon Cæcilian as Bishop of Carthage, and won over to her side seventy Numidian bishops, who, being enraged that the election had taken place without their concurrence, held a conciliabulum (an unlawful assembly, a cabal) in a private house at Carthage (312), and there declared the consecration of Cæcilian to be invalid, because the chief consecrator, Felix, Bishop of Aptunga, had been a *Traditor*. They

¹ One who had betrayed the Holy Scriptures during persecution was stigmatized as a *Traditor*, — i. e. a traitor.

then proceeded to appoint the lector Majorinus, a member of Lucilla's household, as Bishop of Carthage, and he was consecrated by Donatus, Bishop of Casæ Nigræ.

In order to obtain recognition of the bishop appointed by themselves, the schismatics had recourse to the Emperor Constantine the Great, who convened a synod at Rome, under the presidency of Pope Melchiades, to examine the difficulty. This synod declared in favor of Cæcilian. But, the adherents of Majorinus having protested against this decision, the emperor, in order to do away with the pretexts alleged, gave it in charge to his proconsul in Africa, to examine the question whether Felix of Aptunga had been a Traditor, and also laid the whole contention before the Synod of Arles (314). The Donatists, who had received their name from Donatus the Great, successor of Majorinus, made a formal appeal from this synod, at which a decision in perfect harmony with that of Rome had been pronounced, to the emperor. This was the first instance of an appeal to a layman to decide ecclesiastical matters of faith, and it was much against his will that the emperor (316) once more examined the law at Milan. But here, again, he failed in satisfying the schismatics.

In order to subdue their obstinacy Constantine threatened them with civil penalties; but, astonished at their threatening attitude, he afterwards withdrew his wrathful edict (321). The Donatists, after a while, being strengthened by numerous countrymen, committed deeds of horrible cruelty in Numidia and Mauritania, through their Circumcellions, or Circellions (i. e., those who roam about). On this account Constans, after exhausting all friendly means to tranquillize them, was compelled to issue another edict against them; when, with remarkable inconsistency, the Donatists protested against the interference of the emperor in ecclesiastical affairs. Constans, on this, commanded the churches to be taken from them, and sent their leaders into exile. As the schism did not extend beyond Africa, save a community at Rome and in Spain, peace was externally restored for a time. But when Julian the Apostate recalled the exiled leaders, the Donatists took a fearful revenge for the maltreatment which they averred they had formerly suffered at the hands of Catholics. Their fanaticism led them into most irrational proceedings; they even washed the walls of the churches of which they took possession, and spoke the exorcism over those who joined their party.

The number of their bishops soon increased to four hundred.

Outbreaks of such irrational fury called forth edicts against the schismatics under Valentinian (373) and under Gratian (377). They themselves split into parties, and stubbornly rejected all reconciliatory advances and propositions of peace from the Catholics.

Among the Catholic bishops, St. Optatus, Bishop of Mileve, and St. Augustine, combated this heresy. The former directed his work against Parmenian, the Donatist Bishop of Carthage. The latter, in his numerous works against the Donatists, explains the dogmatic differences with transparent clearness, and confutes the erroneous views with most convincing arguments.

The fundamental error of the Donatists consists in the false conception they entertain as to what constitutes the sanctity of the Church. They asserted: (1) That the Catholic Church, by tolerating sinners within her bosom, has ceased to be the true Church; and (2) That the sacraments (specifying baptism), when administered by a sinner, and more especially by a heretic, are invalid. These views, based on a total misapprehension of the Church, and of the office she is destined to perform, involve a denial of the visible Church and of her indefectibility.

But neither the writings of the Bishop of Hippo, nor the conferences instituted by him, could reconcile the Donatists to the Church. They refused all proposals made by the Catholics, with the remark that "the sons of the martyrs could have nothing in common with the race of Traditors." Even the general conference at Carthage (411), attended by two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist bishops and by two hundred and eighty-six Catholic ones, at which the Praetor Marcellinus presided, was ineffectual in restoring harmony. The Donatists, although defeated, appealed anew to the emperor, and, despite the prohibitory edicts issued by the State, persisted in their schism as long as they were subject to the dominion of the Roman Empire or of that of the Vandals, although their numbers had greatly decreased. It was Islamism that finally put an end to the schism.

Less significant was the Meletian rupture, which occurred in Egypt in 305, and is not to be confounded with the Meletian schism in Antioch. This first-named schism was headed by Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, in upper Egypt. Accounts differ as to its origin, but it seems certain that unlawful ordinations performed by Meletius gave rise to it.

The schism which under Pope Liberius was caused by the appointment of an anti-Pope, and another which broke out after his

death (+ 366), in consequence of a contested papal election between the adherents of Pope Damasus (384), and his opponent Ursinus, or Ursicinus, whom Valentinian I. banished to Gaul, was not of long duration.

§ 57. *Trinitarian Conflicts. — Arianism.*

Arianism, which is the direct opposite to Sabellianism, and which subverts the fundamental dogma of Christianity, owes its origin to Arius, a Lybian, who was a pupil of Lucian at the theological school of Antioch, and then went to reside at Alexandria. Here the vain and eccentric man, who was not wanting in intellectual capacity so much as in depth of reflection, joined the Meletians, for which he was excommunicated by the Patriarch Petrus. In 312 he was readmitted into the Church by Achillas, the successor of Petrus, and ordained priest by him. He was then appointed head of the church called Baukalis; and here he lived, honored by the Patriarch Alexander, and in peace with the Church until at a conference he, in presence of his ordinary, in the year 318, publicly and for the first time promulgated his heretical views. His doctrine may be reduced to the following points in essence:¹ —

1. The Logos had a beginning in his existence (*γν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*), and was before the creation brought forth from the Father by an act of the will (*θελήματι καὶ βουλῇ*), out of nothing (*εξ οὐκ ὄντων*), in order that through him, as if by means of an instrument, the world might be created.

2. Consequently the Logos has no eternal existence (*οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν*); rather is he a creature (*κτίσμα, ποίημα*), and not coequal to the Father in essence (*οὐτε ὅμοιος καὶ οὐσίαν*), but alien (*ξένος τε καὶ ἀλλότριος*), and by nature subject to change (*τρεπτός*). He neither knows himself nor his Father perfectly; on which account the names “God,” “Wisdom of God,” are not literally appropriate to him.

It was in vain to endeavor to move the obstinate preacher from his position, or to induce him to retract his blasphemies. The Synod of Alexandria, attended by one hundred bishops, after many fruitless efforts to bring Arius and his followers to reason, found themselves at last compelled to pronounce sentence of excommunication against them (320 or 321).

¹ See *Petavius*, *De theol. dogm. t. ii. de Trinitate*. *Tillemont*, *Mémoires pour servir, etc. t. vi. 2, p. 1 sqq.*

The heresiarch, who was driven from Alexandria, found friends and protectors elsewhere. The influential courtier-bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, a fellow-pupil of Arius, took his part. While sojourning with him, Arius found time to compose his “*Thalia*” (Θάλεα) and other writings in defence of his errors. Eusebius of Cæsarea, for a time at least, also sided with Arius.

To the co-operation of these men it is mainly to be attributed that the number of heresies daily increased; to which, however, it must be confessed that the frivolity of many Christians, the schism of Meletius, together with the art and manner in which Arius defended and promulgated his errors, contributed their full share.

The conflict did not cease with the excommunication; so far from it, it became but the more vehement, and the scandal increased to that degree that the heathens burlesqued the strifes among the Christians in their theatres.

When the unholy strife had reached this point, the Emperor Constantine the Great, who had never understood the importance of the subject under discussion, but had looked upon it as a mere contention respecting the meaning of words, sent Bishop Hosius of Corduba to Alexandria, to effect a reconciliation of the archbishop with the Arian party. Naturally this could only take place by the submission of the heretic; and as this was out of the question, Hosius left Alexandria without having effected his purpose, and on his return made the emperor thoroughly conversant with the importance of the controversy.

Then it was that with the full assent of the Pope, Sylvester I., Constantine convoked

THE FIRST ECUMENICAL COUNCIL AT NICE (325),

at which three hundred and eighteen bishops were present, most of them Oriental. It was presided over by the representatives of the Pope, Bishop Hosius, and two Roman priests, Vitus and Vincentius. The Emperor Constantine himself was also at Nice.

The assembled bishops, only twenty-two of whom favored Arius, settled the controversies respecting the time in which the Paschal festival was to be held, respecting the validity of baptism by heretics, and respecting the reconciling the schismatic Meletians to the Church; but the main business of the council was to examine and reject the heresy of Arius, the author of which was solemnly excommunicated and subsequently exiled to Illyria by the emperor. Some of his adherents met with the same fate.

To set the whole matter at rest, and prevent further equivocation on the dogma of the divinity of the Logos, the Council of Nice inserted in the Apostolic Creed, among other things, the declaration that the Son was "consubstantial with the Father" (*ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ*).

This decision of the council unfortunately failed in its object, alike with the public as with the secret adherents of Arius, who from this time forth turned their endeavors to procure the recall of those in exile to Alexandria, and to excite mistrust against their opponents. In both of these attempts they were successful. Yielding to the request of his sister Constantia, the emperor first allowed some of the followers of Arius and then the heresiarch himself to return home.

Then the intrigues of the Arians (who were also called Eusebians, from Eusebius of Nicomedia) against the Catholic bishops began. The first who was made to feel their vengeance was Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, who on the charge of Sabellianism and other invented crimes was deposed by an Arian synod at Antioch, and banished by the emperor to Illyria.

Encouraged by this success, the Arians now began the conflict with their most powerful antagonist, St. Athanasius the Great. This "Father of Orthodoxy" had cultivated his eminent abilities by the study of philosophy and of the works of Origen; by his intercourse with St. Anthony of Egypt, he had become imbued with a deep interior piety and a firm faith. By his dialectic skill and speculative turn of mind, he was greatly superior to the Arians, and was the one best fitted to overthrow their sophisms. This he had already eminently proved when, as Archdeacon of Alexandria at the Council of Nice, he had demonstrated, in terms of masterly eloquence, the falsity of Arianism, not only from the Scriptures, but from the very definition of Christianity itself and from reason. Again, after his elevation to the Patriarchal See, this great Father of the Church continued to combat this heresy, and to tear to pieces the web of deceits woven by the adherents of this sect.

At first Eusebius of Nicomedia and his associates sought to obtain of Athanasius the readmission of Arius into the communion of the Church. But when neither the letter of Eusebius nor the commands and threats of Constantine, whom Arius had deceived by an ambiguous profession of faith, were able to subdue the constancy of the bishop and induce him to lift the ban of excommunication from their heads, the Arians uniting with the Meletians accused Athanasius of the most atrocious crimes.

Although the patriarch had no difficulty whatever in proving the falsehood of these trumped-up accusations, he was nevertheless excommunicated by the Arian Synod of Tyre (335), and deposed. The condemned, whose innocence had been frequently borne witness to by the Egyptian bishops and clerics, hereupon appealed to the emperor, who convoked the members who had formed the Synod of Tyre. But they had already departed for Jerusalem, to consecrate the Church of the Resurrection. Only the chief enemies of Athanasius answered to the emperor's call, and these brought new accusations against him of conspiracy and murder, and so prevailed with the emperor that Constantine, without even hearing the defence of the celebrated bishop, banished him to the distant city of Treves (335 or 336). Marcellus, Bishop of Aneyra, was also deposed on the charge of Sabellianism.

In the same year (336) Arius was on the point of being restored to the communion of the Church by order of the emperor, when, on the eve of the day fixed for his triumphal entry into the Church of the Apostles, he was taken off by a sudden and fearful death.

After the death of Constantine (337), the exiled bishops, including Athanasius, were permitted to return to their sees; but the Arian party at the court recommenced oppression, especially in the empire of Constantius. Paul, Bishop of Constantinople, who had already been once exiled by Constantine, now went into exile a second time (338), and Eusebius of Nicomedia became, contrary to canon law, the bishop of the capital (341). Acacius, the successor of Eusebius of Cæsarea (+ 340), was also a zealous Arian.

But above all other measures, the sectarians were solicitous to bring about the fall of Athanasius. According to the account given by the Egyptian bishops, the Eusebians set up a certain Pistus as rival bishop, and sent delegates to Pope Julius to effect his recognition. These delegates repeated the accusations, new and old, against Athanasius, whereupon Julius sent information thereof to the accused prelate, who convoked the bishops of his province to a council, and sent plenipotentiaries to Rome for his defence.

Meantime an Arian synod in Antioch, favored by Constantius, had formally deposed Athanasius (340), and appointed the coarse-minded Gregory of Cappadocia as his successor. Four days before the arrival of the latter, Athanasius left his episcopal residence and went to Rome. Here, at a synod to which the Eusebians had been invited but did not appear (341), he was declared free from all guilt.

Nevertheless, the synod held at Antioch in 341 ("in dedicatione") succeeded in deposing him. This synod also drew up four distinct creeds, which are not absolutely heterodox, but in which, however, the text-word *όμοούσιος* is studiously avoided.

At the desire of the Pope, Constans and Constantius convoked the great Synod of Sardica (343), at which one hundred and seventy bishops were present. Among other things the case of St. Athanasius came up for discussion. Hereupon the seventy-six Eusebian bishops refused to take further part in the proceedings. They retired to Philippopolis, where they held a rival council, in which they excommunicated Athanasius, and communicated their decision to the world in a circular dated from Sardica.

The orthodox bishops assembled at Sardica again pronounced Athanasius and some other bishops innocent. They then sent an embassy to the Emperor Constantius, who was at that time at Antioch. The emperor now listened to the voice of justice; and by the advice of his brother Constans, who was at Treves, he allowed the great defender of orthodoxy to return to Alexandria, after an exile of six years. Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Aneyra, and others were also restored to their dignities.

§ 58. *Arianism under Constantius. — Splits among the Arians: the Anomœans and the Semi-Arians.*

The condition of the Catholic bishops was even more unfavorable, when, by the death of Constans, who was murdered in 350 by Magnentius, Constantius, the protector of Arianism, became sole ruler.

Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium in Pannonia, was deposed at a synod held in this city (351). This same synod drew up a creed couched in orthodox words, the first symbol of Sirmium; then the Arian bishops of the court, especially Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa, directed the attention of the emperor to Athanasius, whom they accused of various crimes, even of high-treason.

Pope Liberius, being informed of the crimes imputed to the patriarch, and apprehensive of the worst for Athanasius, induced the emperor to convoke a new synod. This was held at Arles (353). A calm examination of the accusations brought against Athanasius was, however, not to be thought of; for Constantius commanded, under threats of violence, that the bishops present should subscribe to the condemnation of Athanasius. The members of the synod, even the papal legate, Vincent, Bishop of Capua, were overcome by

fear, and obeyed. One prelate alone remained undaunted,—Paulinus, Bishop of Treves. He was banished to Phrygia.

A second synod, convoked at Milan (355) at the desire of the disconsolate Pope, was subjected still more to the authority and tyranny of the emperor, who demanded that “his will should be the canon of the synod.” The bishops who refused to subscribe to the condemnation of Athanasius, and to make common cause with the Eusebians, were deposed and sent into exile. Among these were Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Calaris (Cagliari), Dionysius of Milan, and a centenarian, Hosius of Corduba. Pope Liberius was also banished to Beroea in Thrace. In the following year St. Hilary of Poitiers was exiled by Constantius.¹

Athanasius, expelled from his see by the imperial general Syrianus (356), fled to the Egyptian monks. His place was taken by George of Cappadocia, who inflicted the severest penalties on the orthodox.

After the Council of Milan a time of great suffering began for these. The orthodox bishops were deposed and banished, and men tainted with Arianism were elevated to the episcopal throne; so that very many bishoprics were filled either with Arians proper, or with men whose opinions leaned that way. But it was precisely at the time of persecution that the untenability of heresy and the divinity of the Church shone forth the more conspicuously. Despite the efforts of the emperor, the Catholics remained true to their Church, while the Arians split into different parties, each of which was vehemently opposed to the others.

The strict Arians,—called Anomoeans or Eunomians,—the authors of whose sect were Aëtius (*ᾳθεος*), a deacon at Antioch, and his pupil Eunomius, Bishop of Cyzicus in Mysia, asserted that the Son was unlike the Father (*ἀνόμοος*); he was of another essence (*ἑτέρας οὐσίας*), and came from nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*). The Semi-Arians, on the other hand, whose head was Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, held that the Son was of similar substance with the Father (*ὁμοούσιος*).

The interior discord in the headquarters of the Arians became conspicuously apparent at the second Synod of Sirmium (357). The Anomoeans, who were there in the majority, rejected alike the *ὁμοούσιος* and the *ἐμοούσιος*, and spoke in the plain language of the creed drawn up at this synod, the second of Sirmium: “There is no doubt that the Father is greater than the Son, and that he surpasses that Son in honor, dignity, glory, and majesty,” etc. Indignant at such tenets, the Semi-Arians, in the following year (358), held a

¹ See § 55.

synod at Aneyra, at which they drew up a new creed and anathematized the Sirmian blasphemies.

As the Semi-Arians succeeded in drawing over the Emperor Constantius to their side, the Eunomians were compelled to adopt the third creed of Sirmium, drawn up in 358.

As to the controversy respecting the supposed fall of Pope Liberius, which chiefly relates to the question as to whether this Pope in order to obtain his liberty signed one of the Sirmian formulas, it can be proved to a certainty that this Pope did not sign the second formula.

On the other hand, it is not ascertained to this day, whether Pope Liberius subscribed to the third creed of Sirmium — which, though rejecting the word *όμοούσιος*, is not couched in Arian phraseology — or whether he was allowed to return to Rome without subscribing any formula at all.

Certain it is that he was joyfully received by the faithful Catholics at Rome, and that he showed himself a steadfast defender of the faith. It seems therefore not improbable that Pope Liberius, like St. Hilary, was allowed to return without any restrictive condition being annexed to his regaining his liberty. Be that as it may, it is certain that the Pope did not put forward any decision of faith; at worst, he may be said to have yielded to a personal, a human weakness, in submitting to a formula which in itself was not heterodox.¹

The upper hand — that is, the supreme exercise of power — did not remain long with the Semi-Arians. In 359 Constantius convoked a new synod. Simultaneously the Western bishops were to assemble at Ariminum (Rimini), and the Eastern bishops in Seleucia (Aspera). But before the bishops could meet at the places designated, the Anomœans or Eunomians had succeeded in inducing the emperor to accept a creed formulated by Marcus of Arethusa, the fourth of Sirmium, according to which “the Son is in all things like unto the Father (*όμοιος καὶ πάρτα*), according to the teaching of Holy Writ.” It was proposed that the members of the double synod should likewise sign this formula.

The orthodox bishops at Rimini refused their signature. They rejected Arianism altogether, deposed some of its defenders, and sent ten bishops as delegates to Constantius at Constantinople. But

¹ See *Hefele*, History of the Councils, i. 657 sqq. *Palma*, Praelectiones hist. eccl. iv., Romae, 1872, i. 167 sqq. Compare Cone. Vaticanicum, i. sess. iv., Civ. de Romani Pontificis infallibili magisterio.

the emperor refused an audience to these delegates, and sent them to reside first at Adrianople, and then at Nice in Thrace. Thither came to them some Eunomian courtier-bishops, who at length brought these delegates from Rimini to affix their signature to a symbol very like to the fourth Sirmian formula. Having succeeded in this, they went on to Rimini, where by petitions, lies, and misusage of every kind they compelled the members of the synod also to subscribe the same insidious symbol.

Meantime the Synod of Seleucia had deposed and partly excommunicated the extreme Arians; among whom was Endoxius, Bishop of Antioch. But even here the members of the synod yielded at last to force; compelled as it were by the emperor, they subscribed the formula of Nice-Rimini.

In the following year the courtier-Arian bishops, with Acacius, Bishop of Cæsarea, at their head, held a new synod in Constantinople. They gave up Aëtius, but also, under various pretexts, deposed the leaders of the Semi-Arians, who were exiled by the emperor.

Heresy was now triumphant; nevertheless, the sway of the Aca- cians — who substituted the word *όμους* in the place of *όμοούσιος* and *όμοιούσιος*, and oppressed orthodoxy equally with Semi-Arianism, without being able to maintain strict Arianism — passed rapidly away; for in the year 361 Constantius died, and with him fell the main prop of the heresy itself.

§ 59. *Arianism in its Decline.—The Luciferian and Meletian Schism.—Apollinarians and Macedonians.*

When the Emperor Julian had revoked the edict of banishment promulgated by his predecessor, the exiled Catholic bishops also returned to their sees, and devoted themselves with great zeal and earnestness to the conversion of the Arians, whose readmission into the Church had been greatly facilitated by the easy terms proposed by the Synod of Alexandria (362) to the returning brethren.

This lenient policy became unfortunately the occasion of a division among the Catholic bishops. The vehement bishop Lucifer of Calaris (Cagliari), who shortly before had renewed the conflict with the Meletians by ordaining Paulinus as bishop of the Eustathians in opposition to Meletius, did not approve of the resolutions passed in Alexandria. He separated himself from Athanasius and the bishops of that synod, and for many years the peace of the Church of Anti-

och was disturbed. He placed himself at the head of a schismatical party, called after him the Luciferians; these revived the Novatian principle, relative to the sanctity of the Church. Nevertheless, the work of conversion went on.

In the mean time the controversy had entered into a new phase. The dogma concerning the Holy Ghost had never hitherto been touched in debates with Arians. It now took a foremost position when the Semi-Arian bishop Macedonius of Constantinople asseverated "that the Holy Ghost was utterly unlike the Father and the Son, that he was their servant and a creature."

It was against these heretics, first called Pneumatomachoi by St. Athanasius, and then Macedonians, that the above-named Synod of Alexandria proclaimed the divinity of the Holy Ghost and his consubstantiality with the Father and the Son (362). Besides this, the members of this synod also came to an agreement respecting the use of the expressions *οὐρία* and *ὑπόστασις*, and combated the error of the Bishop Apollinaris of Laodicea, according to whom Christ had a human body and a human *ψυχή*, while the Logos filled the place of the *πνεῦμα*.

St. Athanasius was banished for a fourth time by Julian, and for the fifth time in the reign of the cruel emperor Valens. He died in 373, on his return. His last exile had not lasted long.

After the death of Valens (378), who had been influenced by Bishop Eudoxius of Constantinople to protect Arianism, this heresy gradually declined under the Emperor Gratian and his successors. Its falsehood was triumphantly refuted, not only by St. Athanasius, but also by Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus the Blind of Alexandria, Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, Cyril of Jerusalem, and many others.

The Emperor Theodosius the Great was a powerful protector of orthodoxy in the East. He issued severe edicts against the Arians, and in order to restore peace to the Church, convened the bishops belonging to his own empire to a synod at Constantinople. One hundred and fifty of them attended. These rejected alike the Sabellian with the Arian and the Macedonian heresies; they also, in order to bear witness against the Pneumatomachoi, inserted in the Nicene Creed the words, "We believe . . . in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father (*τὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενος*, John xv. 25).¹ who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified."

¹ At the Council of Toledo (589) the word "filioque" was added to this creed, which subsequently was made a reproach to the Latins by Photius. See § 101.

This council, though not presided over by papal legates, has yet obtained the rank of an oecumenical council, as its dogmatical decisions were ratified by Pope Damasus, and were accepted by the Western bishops;¹ in fact, it is

THE SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.

It was held in 381. In the East, Arianism from this time forth rapidly declined. In the West, on the other hand, it found a powerful protectress in the Empress Justina, mother of Valentinian II., who was strongly resisted by Bishop Ambrose.

After the death of Valentinian II. (392), the penal laws of Theodosius against the Arians were also enforced in the West. This fearful heresy then disappeared from the Roman Empire; but it still lived on for a while, amid the Goths, the Vandals, the Longobards, and the various barbarous nations then rising into notice.

§ 60. *Gnostic-Manichæan Heresies.—Priscillianists and Paulicians.*

About the year 330 the Egyptian Marcus had diffused Gnostic-Manichæan errors in Spain, and had found disciples, at the head of whom was Priscillian, a rich and learned but very ambitious man, who by his attractive personal appearance and pleasant deportment succeeded in spreading the pernicious doctrines, and in winning to his side not only distinguished men and women, but even the bishops Instantius and Salvianus.

When Bishop Hyginus of Corduba had informed Bishop Idacius of Emerita of the existence of the new sect, the latter took measures against them immediately, but in such a manner as to irritate the evil ones without checking them. In order to put a stop to their further irruptions, the bishops of Spain and Aquitaine convoked a synod at Cæsaraugusta (Saragossa, 380), excommunicated the sectarians, whom Bishop Hyginus himself had joined, and intrusted the execution of the sentence to Bishop Ithacius of Ossonuba, who also obtained a rescript from the Emperor Gratian against the sectaries. The journey which Priscillian, who meantime had been consecrated Bishop of Avilla, made with his friends to Rome, did not in any way affect this sentence: yet by dint of bribing Maeodonius, the imperial officer ("magister officiorum"), they succeeded in having the imperial rescript recalled. Instantius and Priscillian were replaced in office, and their opponent Ithacius had to flee to Gaul.

¹ The canons, more especially Canon III. (see § 51), were not confirmed.

After the death of Gratian, the usurper Maximus convoked the Synod of Bordeaux (384), at the request of Ithaeius. Priscillian appealed from its decisions to the emperor. On this he was brought to Treves, to which place he was followed by Idaeus and Ithaeius. Before the imperial tribunal, Priscillian and some of his adherents, among whom was the widow Euchrotia, were convicted of "maleficium" and other crimes; and according to the existing laws they were sentenced to death, which sentence, in spite of the remonstrances of St. Martin of Tours, was put in execution.

With the death of Priscillian, who had been punished not as a heretic, but as a criminal, his sect was not extinguished. His execution, which was also disapproved of by Pope Siricius and St. Ambrose, created great and bitter excitement, especially in the province of Gallicia, where the sectarians found defenders even among the bishops. A certain number of them, among whom were two bishops, became reconciled to the Church at the Synod of Toledo (400). The greater part persisted in their errors, which reappeared under other names in the Middle Ages.

The Paulicians (Publicans, Populicans) may also be considered as descendants of the Manichæans. The founders of this sect were the two brothers, Paul and John of Samosata, whence the sect spread to Armenia, and when proscribed by the edicts of the Greek emperor, sought refuge under the Caliphate. Up to a late period of the Middle Ages it grew and flourished exuberantly, and made its appearance anew in the Albigenses, etc. Their doctrines and moral views are identical with those of Manichæism.

About the year 840 the Paulician Sembat founded the sect of the Thontrakiens, so called from the village Thontrake, in Armenia. They publicly taught Antinomianism, denied the immortality of the soul and the doctrine of Providence, rejected the sacraments, etc. This sect, which was joined by the Metropolitan James of Harkh (1002), maintained itself, in spite of the most severe edicts, until the eleventh century.

§ 61. *Controversies respecting Salvation (Soteriological). — Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism.*

Directly opposed to the Manichæan heresy¹ was the rationalistic system built up by the monk Pelagius (Morgan) and his friend

¹ On the origin of Pelagianism, see *Noris*, *Hist. Pelagiana*, i. 1. *Garnier*, *Diss. 1. De primis auctoribus*, etc.

Cælestius, which closely resembled the false views of the Syrian monk Rufinus,¹ a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

The fundamental error of these two men, who first diffused their doctrines in Rome, consisted in this, that they did not recognize that supernatural sanctity and justice existed in man before his fall into sin; neither did they accept the doctrine of original sin and its consequences; besides which they, totally ignoring the difference between natural and supernatural justice, taught that man could live without sin by his own act, and obtain eternal bliss without the help of grace.²

In this way Pelagius and his adherents denied the “*donum justitiae originalis*,” the “*rectitudo*,” and the gifts of grace in the first man, and asserted: —

1. Adam was created by God in the same state in which children are now born, so that concupiscence, suffering, death, etc., stand in no relation to sin.

2. The sin of Adam was only a passing act, which entailed no serious consequences on his descendants. Adam can only be called the author of sin in so far as he gave the first bad example; therefore there is no original sin, and baptism is not necessary for its forgiveness; but it is necessary simply to effect communion with Christ, and to attain to a full participation of his merits. Baptism is required for the admission into the “*regnum coelorum*,” not for obtaining the “*vita aeterna*.”

3. The will of man is able of itself to fulfil the whole law, to avoid all grievous as also all venial sins, without needing the help of supernatural grace. When, therefore, Pelagians speak of the necessity of grace, they understand thereby, either the natural powers of man (“*gratia naturalis*”), or the law (“*gratia legis*”), or the doctrine and the example of Christ (which they called “*gratia Christi*”), or, finally, the remission of sins. When hard pressed, the Pelagians admitted the existence of an interior grace, which however operates principally on the understanding, and only mediately on the will. But this grace does not enable man, in the first place, to obtain his salvation, but only facilitates his obtaining this his last end; neither is it a free gift of God, but a reward of human merit. This doctrine involves a denial of the dogma that grace is a gratuitous gift.

¹ *Marius Merc.* commonit. c. 2.

² Cf. Cone. Milev. ii. c. 5. *Quicunque dixerit, ideo nobis gratiam justificationis dari, ut quod facere jubemur per liberum arbitrium, facilius possimus implere per gratiam, tanquam, etsi gratia non daretur, non quidem facile, sed tamen possimus etiam sine illa implere mandata divina, anathema sit.*

It was not until Pelagius and Cælestius had left Rome, that their unchristian doctrine became more thoroughly known, and found an opponent in St. Augustine,¹ who in his controversial writings enters into, discusses, and defends the following propositions :—

1. The first man in his original state possessed, besides his natural gifts, also a supernatural sanctity, rectitude, and other gifts of grace, such as immortality² and the like, which were also to be transmitted to his posterity.

2. Through sin Adam lost this supernatural justice, as also the other supernatural gifts of grace; and beside this, he was wounded and weakened in his natural condition.³

3. This sin of Adam is the original sin of the human race; in Adam have all men sinned, on which account guilt and punishment have been the portion of all; and this not only because they have imitated the sin of Adam, but from the fact of being descended ("propagatione") from Adam.⁴ Therefore is the newly born child laden with original sin, for the forgiveness of which sin baptism is required.

4. By the sin of Adam, "libertas"—that is, the freedom of the children of God—was lost; but the "liberum arbitrium" remained to man, even after his fall.⁵ But by free-will alone, man could not attain to eternal bliss, even before he had sinned; much less is it possible to him now that in his present position he is like the wounded man whom the robbers left lying by the wayside.

¹ Tom. x. ed. *Maur.*

² According to *Augustine* (*De correptione et gratia*, n. 33), he had the "posse non mori," but not the "non posse mori." Cf. *De pecc. meritis et remiss.* i. 2, where it is said, "Man in the original state would have attained a mortalitate ad immortalitatem sine media morte;" and *Op. imperfect. cont. Jul.* iv. 79.

³ On the deterioration of the natural gifts of man, cf. *Augustine*, *De nuptiis et concupiscentiis*, ii. n. 57. *Ilo magno primi hominis peccato, natura ibi nostra in deteriorius commutata . . . et tamen ipse langnor, quo bene vivendi virtus periit non est utique natura sed vitium, etc.*

⁴ *Op. imperfect. i. 47* : *Fuit enim Adam et in illo finitus omnes; periit Adam et in illo omnes perierunt.* Cf. iv. 136. *Catholica potius fides peccatum esse originale non dubitat;* *De pecc. meritis et remiss.* i. n. 10. *Hoc propagationis non imitationis est.* Cf. *Civ. Dei*, xiii. 14.

⁵ *Contra duas epp. Pelag.* 1, n. 5. *Quis autem nostrum dicat, quod primi hominis peccato perierit liberum arbitrium de humano genere?* *Libertas* quidem periit per peccatum, *sed illa quae in paradyso fuit, habendi plenam cum immortalitate justitiam;* propter quod natura humana divina indigit gratia, dicente Domino: *si vos filius liberaveritis, tunc vere liberi eritis;* utique liberi ad bene justique vivendum, nam liberum arbitrii usque adeo in peccatore non periit, ut per illud peccent, maxime omnes qui cum delectatione peccant et amore peccati, etc.

5. To work out his salvation and to attain to eternal bliss, man needs the “*gratia eurationis*,” as well as the “*gratia elevationis*.”

6. This grace is an interior one, enlightening the understanding and exciting the will to good: ¹ it is a free gift of God, ² and absolutely necessary to salvation. ³

From Rome, Pelagius and Cælestius went to Carthage. Thither also came Deacon Paulinus of Milan, at whose instance Bishop Aurelius convoked a synod (412) which anathematized Cælestius. Cælestius left Carthage, was ordained priest at Ephesus, and, later on, came to Constantinople.

Pelagius meantime had gone to Palestine, where he was denounced as a heretic by Orosius, a Spanish priest, but protected by John, Bishop of Jerusalem.

The Synod of Jerusalem (415), at which the difference of languages impeded a satisfactory discussion, did not declare against Pelagius, but, on the proposition of Orosius, referred the decision of the controversy to Pope Innocent I. The Synod of Lydda or Diospolis (December, 415), at which fourteen bishops assembled to hear the charges brought against Pelagius and Cælestius by the two bishops of Gaul, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, declared their doctrine orthodox, being deceived by an equivocation which Pelagius gave on the word “grace.”

On the other hand, the African bishops at the synods of Carthage and Mileve (416) renewed the sentence of condemnation against Pelagius and Cælestius; Pope Innocent I. confirmed their decision.

Under his successor Zosimus, Cælestius, who had been driven from Constantinople, came to Rome, and by specious pretences succeeded in imposing on the Pope. Pelagius and Cælestius addressed a creed, together with a hypocritical letter, to the Apostolic See. In a circular letter to the African bishops, the Pope recommended clemency towards the accused, of whose guilt he had not yet been convinced; but these prelates adhered to the decision at which they had arrived at the Synod of Carthage (417), and requested the

¹ *De gratia Christi*, n. 26.

² *De nat. et gratia*, n. 4. *Haec autem Christi gratia, sine qua nec infantes, nec aetate grandes salvi fieri possunt, non meritis redditur, sed gratis datur, propter quod et gratia nominatur.*

³ See preceding note. Cf. *De perfectione justitiae hominis*, n. 42. *Unus mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus, sine cuius gratia nemo a condemnatione liberatur, sive quam traxit ex illo in quo omnes peccaverunt, sive quam postea suis iniquitatibus addidit.*

Pope to uphold the decision of his predecessor. Another plenary council, held at Carthage in the year 418, condemned the Pelagian errors, and this time with the consent of Zosimus.

Zosimus now cited the heretics, against whom the Emperors Honorius and Theodosius II. had issued the "sacrum rescriptum," to appear before a Roman synod. As they did not come, the Pope excommunicated them, and made his decision known to the bishops by the "littera tractoria."

Nearly all the bishops were satisfied with this result: only seventeen, headed by the learned Julian, Bishop of Eclanum (Avellino), in Apulia, refused to subscribe the papal encyclical. They were therefore excommunicated and banished by the Emperor Honorius.

After the death of this emperor, Julian and Cælestius came again into Italy. Pope Celestine I. declined to receive their proposals, on which account they both went together to Constantinople. There they were protected by the Patriarch Nestorius, but found an opponent in a layman from the West, Marius Mercator, a friend of St. Augustine. Finally, the Pelagian and the Nestorian heresies were condemned at one and the same time, at the Council of Ephesus (431).

The monks of Adrumetum having asserted that the doctrine of St. Augustine — which affirms that the eternal salvation of man is due altogether to grace, which is a free gift of God — is subversive of the freedom of the will, St. Augustine wrote two treatises,¹ in which he discusses the relation grace bears to free-will, and proves that grace does not destroy the freedom of the will, but that the will itself, without the help of grace, cannot in very truth do anything good.

More important yet was the conflict waged by St. Augustine against the Semi-Pelagians of southern Gaul, called also Massilians, who intended to effect a compromise between Pelagianism and the Church. They asserted: —

1. Man can by his own power, without prevenient grace ("gratia praeviens"), effect a beginning of faith ("fidei ceptum") and of justification, and in this way merit these.²

2. After obtaining justification men need no special assistance of divine grace for performing meritorious works and for persevering to the end.³

¹ *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, and *De correptione et gratia*.

² Cf. *Aug.* *De praedest. sanct.* n. 43.

³ *Aug.* *De dono persev.* n. 3.

In refutation of this heresy, which denies the necessity of preventient grace and the essentially gratuitous character it bears, as also the "donum perseverantiae," St. Augustine wrote two works ("De praedestinatione sanctorum" and "De dono perseverantiae"), addressed to Prosper, in Aquitania, a priest, and to Hilary, a layman. Among the monks of Massilia (Marseilles) the opposition still continued, and expressed itself in violently blaming the great bishop (+430), whose memory Pope Celestine I. vindicated in a letter to the Gallican bishops in 431. Even the renowned Abbot Cassian of St. Victor, a former disciple of St. John Chrysostom, expressed at this time Semi-Pelagian views;¹ he died, however, at peace with the Church.

Prosper (+463) entered into combat, polemically, with him and other Semi-Pelagians in several works. The unknown author (who was afterwards Pope Leo the Great?) of the book "De vocazione gentium" controverte^d the Semi-Pelagians, while at the same time the anonymous writing (Arnobius the Younger) "Praedestinatus" first caricatured the doctrine of predestination, set forth by the great bishop of Hippo, and then attacked the caricature.

The writings of Faustus, Abbot of Lerin, and from the year 462 Bishop of Riez (Rhegium), were of Semi-Pelagian views, and caused great uneasiness in Constantinople. Bishop Possessor, who had been banished from Africa, appealed, at the instance of the Scythian monks, to Pope Hormisdas on this subject; but the Pope's discreet decision did not satisfy the monks, on which account they sought a judgment on the work of Faustus from the African bishops who had been exiled to Sardinia by Trasamund, King of the Vandals.

Fulgentius of Ruspe (+533) gave a full and complete answer, in the name of fifteen bishops, and also wrote a confutation of the book in question. At a later period these bishops again rejected the work in the "Epistola synodica."

The controversy, however, did not rest. Its principal location was in the south of Gaul. Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles, who in a lucid manner expounded the doctrines of grace and liberty as opposed to the Semi-Pelagian principle, was the principal defender of orthodoxy. Finally, the Council of Orange (Arausicanum II, 529), over which he presided, condemned the Pelagian heresy: and in 530 Pope Boniface II. ratified their decision,² as also he ratified

¹ Cf. *Fessler*, Inst. patrol. ii. 751 sqq.

² The council passed twenty-five canons taken from *Augustine* and *Prosper*, and finished by pronouncing its confession of faith, in which it is said, among other things: *Hoc enim sec. fidem Cath. credimus, quod accepta per baptismum gratia*

the four canons enacted at this council and confirmed at that of Valentia (Valence, 530), which defined the Catholic doctrine on predestination.

In contradistinction to the Pelagian doctrine, the Gallie priest Lucidus, who retracted his errors at the synods of Arles and Lyons (between 475 and 480), taught the “*praedestinatio ad mortem*.” Any peculiar sect of the predestinators does not seem to have been formed.

§ 62. *Christological Controversies; or, Controversies respecting the Person of Christ.—Nestorianism.*

In the fifth century the question as to how the two natures are united in Christ called forth two disturbing heresies on the dogma of the redemption, the germ of which had been already laid in earlier times,¹ as there had ever been opposing tendencies on the above-named question between the Alexandrians and the Antiochians.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, a scholar of Antioch, relying on the duality of natures in Christ, was led to suppose also two persons in him, whose natures he supposed united by an exterior bond (*συνάφεια, ἐνωσις σχετική*), while to each he ascribed a peculiar subsistence proper to itself alone, so that it was only in a figurative sense that Christ could be called one person.

These false principles were adopted by Leporius, a monk of Massilia, in Gaul (426); but they were more vigorously promulgated by Nestorius, a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and afterwards Patriarch of Constantinople (428).

Nestorius, assuming as premises that there are two persons in Christ,—one divine, the other human,—maintained, to the great scandal of the faithful, that the Blessed Virgin should not be called *θεοτόκος*, as it had been the practice to style her; that her highest title was *χριστοτόκος*, or at most, *θεοδόχος*.²

omnes baptizati, Christo auxiliante et co-operante, quae ad salutem animae pertinent, possint et debeat, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere. Aliquos vero ad *malum* divina potestate non solum non credimus, sed etiam, si sunt qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus. The Synod of Valence, held in the same year, passed similar decrees. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, ii. 717.

¹ *Petrav.* Theol. dogm. t. v. de incarn. i. 5. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, ii. 126 sqq.

² From the unity of person in Christ, follows the *communicatio idiomatum in*

The clergy and people of Constantinople alike protested against this novel proposition. The chief polemical opponent to the doctrine was St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, who, without naming Nestorius, explained and defended the orthodox doctrine in many profound treatises.

These refutations had apparently no effect on the person for whom they were written. Nestorius continued obstinate in his heresy, and responded with great bitterness to Cyril's friendly letters. He succeeded in bringing over the weak emperor Theodosius II. to his side, and also attempted to induce the Pope Celestine I. to countenance his errors.

This conduct led Cyril to address a copious and detailed account of the whole matter to the imperial court and also to Pope Celestine, and, according to the ancient custom, to give full information concerning matters that happened in Constantinople.

Hereupon Celestine, at a Synod of Rome in 430, condemned the errors of Nestorius, who had newly addressed the Pope in an ambiguously worded letter; and the carrying out of the decree was committed to the care of Cyril.¹ Cyril convoked his bishops to a synod, and sent the papal documents with twelve anathemas to Nestorius for his signature.

Nestorius replied by sending back twelve counter-anathemas. Even John, Patriarch of Antioch, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, and Andrew, Bishop of Samosata, attacked Cyril's anathematizing, which they called Apollinarianism (*ερωσις φυσικη*). Meantime Theodosius II., in unison with Valentinian III., had convoked the bishops to

THE THIRD ECUMENICAL SYNOD AT EPHESUS,

in 431. The Pope gave his consent, and sent legates, who with Cyril presided over the synod. The emperor was represented by the Count Candidian.

After waiting a long time for John of Antioch and his suffragans, the synod was opened without them; and as Nestorius, who had been repeatedly summoned, did not appear, he was excommunicated.

After the excommunication of Nestorius, John of Antioch and his suffragans arrived at Ephesus, but took no part in the synod; on the contrary, they held a "conciliabulum" in a private apartment *concreto*, which the Nestorians denied; whereas the Monophysites just as erroneously maintained a *communicatio idiomatum in abstracto*.

¹ *Harduin*, i. 1283. The Pope writes: *Auctoritate igitur tecum nostrae sedis adscita, vice nostra usus, hanc exsequeris distretto vigore sententiam.*

at their lodgings, in which, without giving freedom to Nestorius, they excommunicated his opponents, Cyril and Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus.

Theodosius II., excited thereto by the friends of Nestorius, and not rightly knowing the matter under review, seemed rather to side with the heretics, whose friends were very troublesome to the Catholic bishops. These latter found means at last to convey a true account of the whole matter to the emperor; but the schismatics from Antioch also gained his ear, so that he confirmed the resolutions alike of the synod as of the "conciliabulums," and sent the Count John to Ephesus as mediator of peace. This man had Cyril and Memnon arrested, while Nestorius also was in prison.

The Fathers of the synod brought a complaint against this act of violence before the clergy in Constantinople, who, with the celebrated abbot Dalmatius at their head, sided with the complainants. But those of Antioch were not idle. They accused Cyril of Apollinarianism, and sought to gain the good-will of the emperor by submitting to him an orthodox creed.

Theodosius now ordered that eight deputies on each side should assemble at Chalcedon. Here he joined the orthodox bishops, and permitted them to choose a new Bishop of Constantinople in lieu of Nestorius. Then the Fathers at Ephesus were allowed to return to their respective sees. Cyril and Memnon were set at liberty.

To reconcile the schismatic Antiochians to the Church, Theodosius, in conjunction with Pope Sixtus III., applied to Acacius, Bishop of Bercea, and to St. Simeon Stylites, and also sent the tribune Aristolans to Antioch. The Patriarch John of Antioch also entered into negotiations with Cyril; but the work of union went very slowly forward. It met with strong opposition from the bishops of the province of Antioch, notwithstanding that only a small number really entertained the error of Nestorius, while the others only disapproved of his excommunication.

Even the mission of Paul, Bishop of Emesa, whom John had sent to Alexandria, seemed to remain fruitless. Cyril indeed subscribed the Antiochian orthodox symbol; but he also demanded the excommunication of Nestorius. This condition was not accepted by the synod convoked by John. Cyril then addressed himself to the imperial court, and effected that Aristolans and Paul of Emessa should renew negotiations with the Patriarch John, and induce him to affix his signature to the deposition of Nestorius. With this transaction the union was concluded.

But, unhappily, all the bishops did not follow the example of their patriarch. Not only the strict Nestorians, but also the orthodox friends of the heretic, rejected the union at two synods, notwithstanding the explanations given by St. Cyril; and also many opponents of Nestorius, chiefly those who entertained Monophysite views, joined in the rejection. The patriarchs Cyril and John were by these men vehemently and spitefully abused. By the aid of secular authority, however, the latter finally succeeded in carrying out the union. The bishops who resisted were deposed.

Even yet the strife was not at an end. Nestorius, who had at first been shut up in a monastery near Antioch and then banished to Oasis, in Egypt (+ 440), counted even now many adherents, who, as the works of Nestorius himself had been burnt by imperial order, zealously employed themselves in the distribution of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. This induced Rabulas, Bishop of Edessa, to brand with anathema the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and those of Diodorus of Tarsus. The priest Ibas, of the school of Edessa, who became the successor of Rabulas, revenged this by inditing an ironically toned letter to the Persian bishop, Maris of Hardashir.

It was thus that in the Roman Empire Nestorianism was gradually suppressed. The theological school of Edessa, which was a daughter of that of Antioch, was destroyed by the Emperor Zeno in 489.

The Nestorians themselves emigrated to Persia, where Thomas Barsumas, Bishop of Nisibis, on being driven from Edessa, had founded a congregation (435). Favored by the Persian kings, the number of their adherents continued to increase, and in 499 a formal separation ensued between them and the Catholic Church.

Their Patriarch of Seleucia-Ctesiphon bore the title *καθολικός* (Jazelich). In India they called themselves Christians of St. Thomas. They spread as far as China.

§ 63. *Monophysitism.*

The Archimandrite Eutyches¹ at Constantinople, after energetically combating the Nestorian heresy, fell into an error diametrically opposed to it in denying the duality² of natures in Christ.

¹ On Eutyches and the Council of Chalcedon, see *Hefelc*, Hist. of the Councils.

² At the Synod of Constantinople (488) he declared: 'Ομολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆσθαι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐνώσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ. Cf. *Harduin*, ii. 165.

The first opponents of this heresy were Domnus, Patriarch of Antioch, Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum in Phrygia, and the learned Theodoret of Cyrus. Eusebius, besides controverting his doctrine, brought an accusation against the heretic before Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, who at his synod (*σύνοδος ἐνδημούσα*) in 448 pronounced the anathema against Eutyches, the narrow-minded and stubborn man.

The condemned heretic, who did not submit himself to the decision of the synod, possessed powerful friends, among whom were the Eunuch Chrysaphius, and the violent Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, both enemies of Flavian. He, Eutyches, also appealed to Rome; and Leo called Flavian to account for the proceedings in Constantinople. The Emperor Theodosius II., chiefly influenced by his wife Eudocia, took part with Eutyches, and conjointly with Valentinian III. convoked a synod, on the petition of himself and friends. To this Pope Leo the Great assented,¹ and sent three legates to Constantinople. These legates brought, besides other letters from the Pope, a dogmatical epistle from him to Flavian, in which the Pope, in refutation of Nestorius and Eutyches, clearly lays down that by the birth of Christ from the Virgin Mary nothing was abstracted from or superadded to his divine and eternal birth from the Father;² that, on the contrary, the two natures remain in their full integrity, uninjured by their contact, each in its individual operative power³ united in one person, and thus constitute the Christ; of whom, consequently, it may be correctly affirmed that the Son of Man came down to earth, and that the Son of God was crucified,⁴—which can only be denied by those who by their non-recognition of the two natures existing in Christ

¹ Eutyches and the emperor had appealed to the Pope.

² *Salva igitur proprietate utrinque naturae et substantiae, et in unam coenente personam, suscepta est a maiestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab aeternitate mortalitas et ad resolvendum conditionis nostrae debitum, natura inviolabilis naturae est unita passibili: ut, quod nostris remedii congruebat, unus atque idem mediator Dei et hominum, homo Jesus Christus et mori posset ex uno, et mori non posset ex altero. In integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris* (c. 3).

³ *Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est* (c. 4).

⁴ *Propter hanc ergo unitatem personae in utra natura intelligendam et filius hominis legitur descendisse de coelo, cum filius Dei carnem de ea virgine de qua est natus, assumserit. Et rursus filius Dei crucifixus dicitur et sepultus, cum haec non in Divinitate ipsa . . . sed in naturae humanae infirmitate sit perpessus* (c. 5).

in hypostatic union virtually reject and nullify the dogma of the redemption.¹

The synod convoked by the two emperors was held at Ephesus in 449. Dioscorus, disregarding the privilege due to the papal legates, took the presidential chair; and another violation of customary regulations took place when the Abbot Barsunas, who was there as representative of the Archimandrite, was allowed a seat and also a vote in the assembly. Under such auspices the deliberations commenced, in which Dioseorus took the chief part. He was powerfully supported by the fanatical monks and by the imperial officers. The result of these deliberations was that the synod finally decreed the readmission of Eutyches into the communion of the Church and the excommunication of his opponents. Flavian, besides being excommunicated, was so cruelly treated that he soon after died.

Pope Leo, to whom the Patriarch Flavian and Theodoret had appealed, in a synod held at Rome in the same year, rejected the decrees of the Robber Synod (*σύνοδος ληστρική*, "latrocinium Ephesinum"). Theodosius II., on the other hand, ratified the decrees of Ephesus, and sturdily resisted the Pope, who with the co-Emperor Valentinian III. called for another synod.

After the death of Theodosius II. (450), his sister Pulcheria, who married the able Marcianus, ascended the imperial throne, and immediately commenced a correspondence with the Pope in regard to convoking a synod. A mental change had taken place among the bishops of the East in favor of orthodoxy. A synod held by Flavian's successor (November, 450) at Constantinople adopted the dogmatical epistle written by Leo, to which the prelates subscribed their names, and very many Eutychians returned to the Church. Under these circumstances the Pope held that it was neither necessary nor expedient to convoke a further council, yet he yielded to the wishes of the emperor, who, having obtained the Holy Father's consent, summoned

THE FOURTH ECUMENICAL SYNOD IN CHALCEDON (451).

The three papal legates presided. The six hundred bishops present, most of whom were Orientals, unanimously adopted the dogmatical epistle of the Pope, with the words: "This is the faith of the Fathers. this is the faith of the apostles; it is also our faith, — the faith of

¹ Nam si crucem Domini non putat falsam, et susceptum pro mundi salute suppli-
cium verum fuisse non dubitat; enjus credit mortem, agnoscat et carnem . . . quo-
nia negatio verae carnis, negatio est etiam corporeae passionis (c. 5).

every one of us. PETER HATH SPOKEN BY THE MOUTH OF LEO."¹ They then excommunicated Eutyches and his followers, and drew up a profession of faith (a creed)² directed expressly against the Nestorians and Eutychians.

The adherents of Eutyches, called Monophysites from their assertion that there was but one nature in Christ, persistently rejected the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, and persecuted the orthodox bishops. In Jerusalem, Juvenalis the Patriarch was compelled to leave his see, of which a Monophysite monk named Theodosius took possession. He was supported in his usurpation by the Empress-widow Eudocia, and in Alexandria the party of the deposed Dioscorus refused obedience to the new patriarch, Proterius. At the head of the mutineers stood Timotheus Eluros (*ἄλουρος*, cat), who after the murder of Proterius took possession of the patriarchal throne himself. At Antioch, Peter Fullo (*γναφεῖς*) compelled the Patriarch Martyrius to resign his dignity, which he then assumed to himself. The heretical patriarchs anathematized the Council of Chalcedon.

Leo, the successor of Marcian, drove the Monophysite patriarchs Eluros and Peter Fullo from their sees. Nearly all the bishops of the empire (who numbered about sixteen hundred) declared (458) the decrees of Chalcedon sacred and inviolable. In the years 475–477 Basiliscus the usurper, having overcome Zeno, who had ascended the throne after Leo, and wishing to gain the good-will of the Monophysites, reinstated the schismatical bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, and commanded that all the bishops of his empire should reject the dogmatic epistle of Leo and the decrees of Chalcedon. On this five hundred bishops of the Greek Church showed themselves weak enough to comply with this command, and to sign the imperial encyclical, which was, in fact, the first formal act of faith issued by a Christian ruler. But Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, however vacillating he had shown himself before, now remained steadfast, and even compelled the tyrant to withdraw his edict.

At length Zeno succeeded in driving off the usurper. His second accession to the throne (477–491) under the zealous Pope Simplicius brought, however, no advantage to the Church. The schismatical bishops Peter Fullo and Peter Mongus (*μόγγος*, the stammerer), suc-

¹ *Actio II. Harduin*, ii. 305.

² The passage respecting this runs: 'Ἐκδιδάσκομεν . . . ἔνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν νιὸν μονογενῆ ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως (against Eutyches), ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως (against Nestorius) γνωριζόμενον. *Harduin*, ii. 455.

cessor to *Æluros*, were indeed exiled anew; but the emperor himself (482) caused the greatest embarrassment to the Church by the publication of his miserable "Henotikon," a document composed by the ambitious Acacius of Constantinople and Peter Mongus, who had been re-elected Patriarch of Alexandria by the Monophysites. In this document, although Nestorius and Eutyches were anathematized, the expression "two natures" was carefully avoided, and only the symbol of Nicæa Ct. acknowledged and exclusively enforced. This "formula of concord" was equally displeasing to Catholics and to the strict Monophysites. It increased the disturbance, and gave rise to a new Monophysite party in Alexandria, the Acephali (*ἀκεφαλοι*); it also called into being the Oriental schism that continued to the year 519.

The reign of the Emperor Anastasius (491-518) was still more detrimental to the Church. Under him the Monophysites, headed by Xenaias (Philoxenus), Bishop of Hierapolis, and the monk Severus, gained the upper hand. The orthodox patriarch Flavian of Antioch was banished (513), and his place filled by Severus. About the same time the Patriarch Elias was driven from Jerusalem. Since 508 the Episcopal See of Alexandria had been occupied by John Nikeota (Machiota), a strict Monophysite. The universal dissatisfaction of the people and the threats of General Vitalian at length compelled Anastasius to take measures by which he could come to an understanding with the Apostolie See. The transactions of the emperor with Pope Hormisdas led, however, to no favorable result.

The reconciliation was at length effected (519) under the Emperor Justin I. His nephew Justinian I. the Synodite was also opposed to the Monophysites, whom he hoped to bring back to the Church by a religious conference between five Catholic and six Monophysite bishops held at Constantinople in 533.

But his consort, Theodora, was secretly favorable to the Monophysite doctrine, and even attempted to make it prevail at Rome. In fact, she did succeed in causing the banishment of the Pope Silverius, and in forcing the Romans to acknowledge the equivocating deacon Vigilius, who had placed himself on the papal throne. In spite of this, her purpose was frustrated; for after the death of Silverius (+ 540), on the island of Palmaria, Vigilius resigned the papal dignity which he had usurped, but was then canonically re-elected, after which he defended the orthodox doctrine.¹

The formula "who has been crucified for us," which Peter Fullo

¹ *Baron. Annal. ad ann. 540, n. 9 sqq.*

and others wished to add to the Trisagion, and which was afterwards changed by some Seythian monks at Constantinople into “one of the Trinity was crucified” (Theopaschites), occasioned some trouble under Pope Hormisdas, who thought it dangerous on account of its ambiguity. The controversy became more vehement at Constantinople, when the Acoimeti (533) rejected the proposition, together with the word *θεοτόκος*. Pope John II., while confirming the dogmatical edict of the Emperor Justinian (534), anathematized the Acoimeti; he was satisfied of the orthodox sense of the formula, without directly approving of the formula itself. Agapetus I. (535) did the same thing; as also the Fifth Ecumenical Council (535).

More than any very ancient heretical sects, the Monophysites were split up into different parties. The *φθαρτολάτραι* (Corruptibilists) asserted after Severus the corruptibility, the *ἀφθαρδοκύται* (Phantasiastes) asserted after Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, the incorruptibility, of Christ’s body. From the first of these parties proceeded the *ἀγνοηταί*, followers of the deacon Themistius, who maintained: “Si corpus Christi corruptibile est, debemus eum dicere, et aliqua ignorasse.”¹

The Julianists split into two parties, the *κτιστολάτραι* and *ἀκτιστήται*, the first of which maintained that the body of Christ had been created, the latter that it was uncreated.

The extreme sect of the Monophysites were the Niobites (after Stephen Niobes), who maintained that there was no real difference between the divine and human elements in Christ.

Tritheistic errors were taught by the Monophysite John Ascensiones, head of a school in Constantinople (sixth century). These tritheistic doctrines were defended by John Philionus, by the monk Athanasius, by a grandson of the Empress Theodora, and by other Monophysites. The assertion of Philionus that “the human body as to matter and form passes over to corruption” divided the Tritheistics into Philionists and Cononists. In combating Tritheism, Damian, Patriarch of Alexandria, fell into Sabellianistic error. His followers are called Damianists, or Tetradietes.

The Monophysites spread themselves especially in Egypt, where as Coptic Christians (better known as the Copts) they acted in a very hostile manner towards the Catholics (Melchites), and later on (640) were subjugated by the Mahometans. From Egypt the heresy spread to Abyssinia.² Armenia also embraced it.³ At

¹ Liberat. breviar. c. 19. *Colet*, Acta conc. vi. 452.

² See § 40.

³ See § 36.

the Council of Florenee (1439), a number of the Armenian Monophysites returned to the Church. During the Council of the Vatican a small part of the reunited Armenians separated again from their patriarch, Hassun of Constantinople. (See § 214.)

Jaeob Baradai (Jacobites) exerted himself unceasingly in increasing and placing this sect on solid foundations. In 1646 a number of the Jacobites returned to the Church (Patriarchate of Aleppo).

§ 64. The Origenist Controversy, and the Quarrel on the Three Chapters.

Various errors contained in the writings of Origen — such as (1) Subordinationism ; (2) The theory of the creation ; (3) The doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, and the former equality of spirits ; (4) The views on the nature of sin and punishment, especially on the *ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων* — gave rise in the course of time to vehement disputes respecting the orthodoxy of Origen ; some entering the lists to defend him, others to attack him.

As early as the fourth century the holy bishop Methodius of Tyre (+ 309) wrote against the great Alexandrian, who was defended by Pamphilus the Martyr, and Eusebius of Cæsarea.

During the Arian controversies these disputes concerning Origen were relegated to the background. The great champions of orthodoxy — Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzen, and others — studied and prized the writings of Origen, without, however, adopting his erroneous propositions.

After the Arian heresy had been confuted, the conflict against Origen was renewed with increased warmth, in that he was looked upon as the instigator of Arianism. The field of battle was Egypt and Palestine. Even St. Jerome and his friend Rufinus were cited as Origenists (394). St. Jerome defended his own orthodoxy ; Rufinus maintained a complete silence. Some time later, St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, came to Jerusalem and preached against the Origenists ; whereby he fell into a conflict with John, the Bishop of Jerusalem. Jerome took part with Epiphanius, but Rufinus sided with the Bishop John. Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, succeeded, however, in reconciling the two friends (397). Then, unfortunately, Rufinus went to Rome, and by giving out an inaccurate translation of Origen's "Periarchon," caused St. Jerome to begin a bitter polemical correspondence with his friend.¹

The conflict raged with greater bitterness in Egypt, where the

¹ Rufinus, who was highly esteemed by St. Paulinus, died in 410.

Anthropomorphic monks of the Sketistian Desert were in strife with the spiritualistic monks of the Mountain of Nitria. The Patriarch Theophilus, at first an admirer of Origen, declared against him in his pastoral letter of the year 401, interdicted the reading of his works, and treated the monks of Nitria with great severity. Several of these, headed by the four tall brothers Dioscurus, Ammonius, Euthymius, and Eusebius, fled to Constantinople. St. Chrysostom sought in vain to make peace between them. At length the monks complained to the emperor of the patriarch, who was then summoned to the imperial capital to answer for his conduct. To escape condemnation himself, he induced the aged Epiphanius, who saw through the fraud when too late, to accuse St. Chrysostom (402) at Constantinople of partiality towards the Origenists. On this Theophilus went to Constantinople himself, and caused the holy patriarch to be deposed.

A new conflict on the subject of Origen broke out in 520. The monks who favored Origen, headed by Nonnus and Leontius, and countenanced by Domitian, afterwards Bishop of Aneyra, and Theodore Askidas, later Archbishop of Caesarea, after the death of St. Sabas (531), went to their opponents, whom they called Sabaites, and drove them from the Great Laura,¹ of which they took possession themselves.

The expelled monks applied to the Patriarch, Ephraem of Antioch, who in the year 542 rejected the errors of Origen at a synod. It was in the same year that the persecuted monks, through the mediation of the papal Apocrisiarius and the influence of Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, brought their grievances before the Emperor Justinian I., who (543) censured in an edict ten propositions extracted from the writings of Origen. The permanent synod (543) rejected in fifteen anathemas the erroneous assertions of the great theologian.

The disputes were not terminated by these proceedings. The Origenists even regained the upper hand in Palestine, but split into parties among themselves, among which the Protoktistoi and Isochristoi deserve special mention; the first of these were finally obliged to submit.

Closely connected with Monophysitism is the dispute on the three chapters excited by Theodore Askidas, who represented to the Emperor Justinian I. that the Monophysites would return to the Church

¹ A *Laura* was a number of separate cells inhabited by hermits. The Laura of St. Sabas contained one thousand cells.

if the so-called three chapters, which were stumbling-blocks of offence to them, were anathematized ; these three chapters (*τρία κεφάλαια*) were : —

1. The person and the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia ;
2. The writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against St. Cyril and the Ephesinum ; and,
3. The letter of Ibas to the Persian bishop Maris.

The emperor, not discerning the intention of Theodore, issued an edict (544) in which these three chapters (principal points) were condemned. This edict was signed by the patriarchs of the East ; the Western bishops, on the contrary, protested against the imperial anathemas, in which, according to their view, lurked danger to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. This council had, it is true, received the writings of Theodoret and Ibas, but had not pronounced them correct in all points. In order to conquer their resistance, Justinian invited Pope Vigilius to Constantinople. He came, though it was with reluctance, in the year 547. He refused to condemn the three chapters, and broke off all communion with the Patriarch Mennas. Later, however, he assented to a condemnation, first in a private letter to the emperor, and in 548 in his "Judicatum" addressed to Mennas expressly providing, however, against any detriment to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon¹ ("salva in omnibus reverentia Synodi Chalcedonensis"). By this act the Pope caused a schism in the West without conciliating the Monophysites.

In order to bring back peace to the Church, the Pope and the emperor agreed to convene a synod ; but before this could assemble, Justinian, in violation of agreement and of the right of ecclesiastical authority to decide matters of controversy, issued a new edict against the three chapters. The Pope refused to acknowledge the edict, and excommunicated the bishops who had subscribed it.

The emperor revenged himself on the Pope (Vigilius), who was compelled to seek security first in St. Peter's basilica at Constantinople, and then in the Church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon. From this place (January, 552) he issued his edict of the 15th August (551) against the Patriarch Mennas and his bishops, against Theodore Askidas, who was deposed from his dignity, and against several others. He also made known the reasons of his conduct in an encyclical letter addressed to the Catholic world at large.

At this crisis the situation of the Pope was doubtless a very difficult one. Yet a splendid triumph was at hand. The condemned

¹ *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, ii. 797.

bishops, nay, even the Patriarch Mennas, submitted to him a profession of faith, in which they accepted the decrees of the four œcumeneal councils as sanctioned by papal authority, and begged for the withdrawal of the censures hanging over them. Vigilius granted their petition, and returned to Constantinople; but though entreated to do so by a special embassy, he declined to preside at, or even to attend,

THE FIFTH œCUMENICAL SYNOD OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN 553.

On the 14th May, 553, the Pope published his "Constitutum," condemning the errors and offensive assertions contained in the three chapters without condemning the authors. The emperor did not accept this constitution. The one hundred and fifty Oriental bishops assembled in conclave, who knew nothing whatever of this writing of the Pope's, condemned in the eighth session, June 2, the three chapters. It was not till the 23d February (554) that the Pope, banished and hard-pressed by the emperor, confirmed, by his second "Constitutum," the decrees of the council, without, however, making any mention of said council, which gradually received the name of the Fifth œcumeneal Council. Soon after this the Pope set out to return to Rome, but died on his road thither, at Syracuse in Sicily (555).

Pope Pelagius I., his successor (555-560), also approved the Fifth œcumeneal Council, which, however, encountered great opposition in the West; so great, indeed, that a part of the Western bishops broke off all communion with the Apostolic See. But this opposition gradually melted away. The Emperor Justin II., and still more the Popes Pelagius II. and his successor Gregory the Great, were very earnest in their endeavors to heal the schism. Aquileia held out the longest. It was not till the year 700 that the last of the schismatics returned to the Church at the Synod of Aquileia.

The vacillating conduct of Vigilius was principally caused by the trying circumstances in which he was placed. The condemnation of the three chapters, which might be misused by the Monophysites to the degradation of the Council of Chalcedon, had brought the Western bishops into collision with the Apostolic See, while the defence of the same had occasioned outrages of various kinds to be inflicted on the Pope, and left the worst to be dreaded for the East. The change in the conduct of Vigilius was regulated as the one or the other of these motives prevailed.

But these contradictory decisions did not touch the dogma itself. In this the Pope preserved his consistency, as is proved by his censure of the extracts containing erring propositions of Theodore's and Theodoret's writings.

The question is whether or not it was opportune to condemn the writings named, seeing that the Council of Chalcedon had not decided that they should be rejected.

§ 65. *Monothelitism.*

This heresy is but another form of Monophysitism.¹ It probably originated with Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who proposed to the Emperor Heraclius the adoption of the formula *In Christ is ἐν θέλημα καὶ μία ἐνέργεια* (In Christ there is but one will, one ruling force or energy), as an appropriate means of reconciling the Monophysites with the Church. The emperor, who had more than one reason for wishing to put an end to these dogmatical disputes, entered into the plan of the artful patriarch, who had already gained over to his side Theodore, Bishop of Pharam, in Arabia; and in his expedition against the Persians, and still more after his victory over them, he exerted considerable energy in order to induce the Catholic and Monophysite bishops to adopt this formula.

His efforts were partly successful. Bishop Cyrus of Phasis, in Lazia, deceived by an equivocal letter from Sergius, and a letter forged by him, purporting to be from the Patriarch Mennas, adopted this formula as early as the year 626; and having been transferred to the See of Alexandria in 630, he put forth his utmost exertions to reunite a party of the Monophysites — the Theodosians, or Severians — to the Church. This result ensued in the year 633. The reunion was established on the basis of a union formula consisting of nine articles, of which the seventh affirmed that the same one Christ and Son performed the things becoming to God and the things proper to man, by one divine and human operation (*μιᾷ θεατρικῇ ἐνέργειᾳ*).

But this union, effected at the cost of orthodoxy, found an opponent in Alexandria in the person of the learned monk Sophronius, who pointed out the heretical sense of said formula. But as Cyrus disregarded the representations made in good-will by Sophronius, the latter applied to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, whose views were at that time unknown to him. This dissembler, who to

¹ *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, iii. 110 sqq.

all appearance assumed the rôle of mediator, declared that the dispute would be best settled by avoiding either expression, — “one energy,” or “two energies.” He therefore rejected both.

But Sophronius refused to accept this proposal of Sergius, who by setting aside both formulas sought indirectly to uphold his own error; and being on his return elevated to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, he in his synodical letter defended the doctrine of “two energies” in Christ, and branded the doctrine of a “single energy alone” as a Monophysite error.

Sergius, in the hope of gaining over Pope Honorius (625–638) to his side, wrote him a skilfully worded letter, in which he magnified the advantages of the Alexandrian union, using the most exaggerated terms. He mentioned the opposition of Sophronius to the formula of union, and added that, in his opinion, the work of reunion should not be endangered by this controversy on mere words (*λογομαχία*). Therefore it was better to avoid both expressions, to speak neither of “one” nor of “two” energies in Christ: because by the first, although it had been used by some of the Fathers, one might incur the suspicion of denying the two natures in Christ; and by the second, which the Fathers had not used, one laid one’s self open to the accusation of accepting the notion of two wills contradicting each other (*δύο θελήματα ἐναντίως πρὸς ἄλληλα ἔχοντα*). Therefore it is better to keep to the doctrine of the Fathers, and confess that from the same Incarnate Word every divine and human operation proceeds inseparably and indivisibly (*πάσαν περιέναι ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως θείαν τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν*); or that every form in communion with the other works out its own peculiar characteristic, as was said by the Pope St. Leo the Great.

In order not to rend asunder the union so recently formed, Pope Honorius, thus deceived by Sergius, deemed it advisable to let the “new war of words” settle itself to rest. Wherefore, without participating in the error of the Monothelites, he, in his reply to the patriarch, admonished (“hortantes”) the faithful neither to make use of the expression “one energy” nor “two energies,” as one might be interpreted to signify Eutychianism, the other Nestorianism; but he advised them simply to confess that one and the same Christ performs divine and human acts. But this injunction of the Pope could not be carried out. The Patriarch Sophronius defended Dyothelitism with great ability, and was so far effective in convincing the Pope, that Honorius, in his second letter to Sergius (of which we only possess a fragment), expressed himself in a much clearer

and more precise manner respecting the point at issue, without, however, using the formula *δύο ἐνέργειαι*.

To put an end at once to further controversy, an edict called "Ekthesis," composed by Sergius, was published by the Emperor Heraclius, in which the use of the expressions "one energy," "two energies," was forbidden; while it was asserted that there was but one will in Christ. The emperor commanded the bishops to sign their names to this edict. In two synods held at Constantinople (638, 639), the Oriental bishops complied with the imperial behest. On the other hand, those of the West, especially the Popes John IV. (640-642) and Theodore I. (642-649), rejected the "Ekthesis" and protested against the encroachments of the emperor.

The Monothelites made one more effort to keep their footing, although their errors had been exposed with irresistible arguments by the celebrated abbot Maximus; they still hoped, with the aid of the emperor, to attain their end. At the instigation of Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, the Emperor Constans II. published a dogmatic edict, called the "Typus," and threatened all with severe penalties who did not accept it. Again were the Eastern prelates ready to execute the emperor's will; and again did the Pope assert his supreme authority. Pope Martin I. (649-654), at a Lateran Synod (649), rejected the "Typus" alike with the "Ekthesis," and anathematized the Monothelite heresy and its leaders. In revenge, Constans exposed the Pope to a most cruel treatment at Constantinople, then banished him to Chersonesus, where he died as a martyr, after having gloriously defended the true faith. The same fate awaited Maximus, with his disciples the two Anastasii, and other defenders of Dyothelitism.

The state of affairs began to change somewhat for the better under Pope Vitalian, even during the lifetime of Constans, who was afterwards murdered; but a thorough reconciliation did not take place till the reign of Constantine Pogonatus (668-685), who, desiring to reconcile the Eastern with the Western Church, entered into negotiations with the Holy See, the result of which was the convocation of

THE SIXTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL AT CONSTANTINOPLE, 680.

This was convoked by the emperor with the consent of Pope Agatho (678-682). The one hundred and seventy-four bishops present accepted Pope Agatho's dogmatic epistle,¹ and rejected the Monothelite

¹ On the duality of will, the Pope expresses himself thus: *Cum duas autem naturas duasque naturales voluntates, et duas naturales operationes confitemur in*

heresy; the Fathers of the synod also issued a special decree of faith, in which the dogma of two natural wills in Christ and two natural operations in the Incarnate God, was distinctly defined.¹ The opposing bishops, whose leader was Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, were excommunicated.

The council pronounced anathemas against Theodore of Pharam, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Paul, Peter of Constantinople, nay, also upon Pope Honorius.

The decrees of the council were confirmed by Pope Leo II., and thereby the victory of Catholic truth decided. Only the Maronites on Mount Lebanon continued to hold to this heresy; and in the twelfth century a part of these returned to the Church.

As neither the Fifth nor the Sixth Ecumenical Council had passed canons relating to discipline, the Emperor Justinian II. convoked (692) a council to meet at Constantinople, for the express purpose of re-establishing ecclesiastical discipline. This was the "Concilium quinisextum," or Trullanum II., which passed one hundred and two canons relative to the organization and discipline of the Church, but couched in language denoting a great aversion and bitterness of feeling for the Latin people. The Greeks place this Second Trullan Synod in the number of oecumenical councils. It has never been acknowledged as such by the Apostolic See.

Besides the professions of faith passed by the oecumenical councils that have been mentioned, several other private symbols exist, among which the so-called Athanasian Creed, or Quicunque, takes the first place. This creed, however, was not composed by St.

uno Domino nostro Iesu Christo non contrarias eas, nec adversas ad alterutrum dicimus . . . nec tanquam separatas in duabus personis vel subsistentiis, sed duas dicimus eundemque Dominum nostrum I. Christum sicut naturas ita et naturales in se voluntates et operationes habere, divinam scilicet et humanam, etc. (*Harduin*, iii. 1079). The Pope very strongly emphasizes the unblemished purity of the doctrine of the Apostolic See: *Haec est enim verae fidei regula, quam in prosperis et in adversis vivaciter tenuit ac defendit haec spiritualis mater vestri tranquillissimi imperii, apostolica Christi ecclesia, quae per Dei omnipotentis gratiam a tramite apostolicae traditionis *nunquam* errasse probabitur, nec haereticis novitatis depravata succumbit, sed . . . *illibata* fine tenus permanet, etc. (*Harduin*, iii. 1082).*

¹ *Harduin*, iii. 1400. This runs thus: Δύο φυσικάς θελήματις, ήτοι θελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ δύο φυσικάς ἐνέργειας, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσιγχύτως . . . καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικά θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία . . . ἀλλ ἐπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ (scl. Χριστοῦ) θέλημα, καὶ μὴ ἀντιπίπτον ἢ ἀντιπαλαῖον, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θείῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι.

Athanasius, but by an unknown author; it was originally written in the Latin language, and dates from the sixth century.

In reference to the controversy concerning Pope Honorius, the first question is, In what did the Pope do wrong? This is answered pithily and definitely by Pope Leo II., in his letter to the Spanish bishops. Honorius is condemned for not having extinguished the incipient flame of heretical dogma, as was due to the position he held of apostolic authority; he having rather fanned the flame by his negligence,—“Quia flamnam haeretici dogmatis non, ut deuit apostolicam auctoritatem incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit.”

That Honorius in his two letters had no intention of giving a dogmatic decision, much less a decision *ex cathedra*,—that he in no way shared the Monothelite views,—is proved by the letters themselves, in which he clearly speaks of the two natures in Christ, of their inviolability and of the operation peculiar to each: for example, “Utrasque naturas in uno Christo unitate naturali copulatas cum alterius communione operantes atque *operatrices* confiteri debemus; et divinam quidem, quae Dei sunt, operantem: et humanam, quae carnis sunt, exequentem, non divise, neque confuse, aut convertibiliter Dei naturam in hominem et humanam in Deum conversam edocentes . . . oportet nos *unum operatorem* Christum Dominum in *utrisque naturis* veridice confiteri: et pro duabus operationibus, ablato geminae operationis vocabulo, ipsas potius duas naturas, id est divinitatis et carnis assumptae, in una persona Unigeniti Dei Patris, inconfuse, indivise, atque inconvertibiliter nobiscum praedicare *propria operantes*” (Ep. II.).

But whether Honorius by the words, “Unde et unam voluntatem (*Ἐν θέλημα*) fatemur Domini nostri J. Chr.” (Ep. I.), meant the Monothelite heresy or otherwise, is best deduced from his own explanation of this sentence, which is worded thus: “Quia profecto a divinitate assumpta est nostra natura, non culpa: illa profecto, quae ante peccatum creata est, non quae post praevicationem vitiata . . . quae repugnaret legi mentis ejus. Nam lex alia in membris, aut voluntas diversa non fuit vel contraria salvatori.” Here the Pope excludes only *such two* wills as are contradictory to each other, and understands by the “una voluntas” the moral unity, but by no means the physical union, of the wills.

But when Honorius goes on, “Et si quidem scriptum est: Non veni facere voluntatem meam, sed ejus, qui misit me, Patris. Et: Non quod ego volo, sed quod tu vis Pater, et alia hujusmodi: non

sunt haec diversae voluntatis, sed dispensationis humanitatis assumptae. Ista enim propter nos dicta sunt quibus dedit exemplum, ut sequamur vestigia ejus," — he only means to say by this that these passages of Holy Writ do not refer to a conflict between the divine and the human will, but to a compliance with the requirements of the human nature he had assumed; that is, it was a perfectly voluntary condescension to our weakness on the part of the Savior, in consequence of which he permitted the fear of suffering to come over him and really affect him, that he might leave us an example.

The correctness of this view is obvious: (1) From the expression "dispensatio" (*oikovopūa*), used by Honorius, and which the Fathers for the most part employ to express the incarnation, chiefly however the suffering of Christ, and in general terms all that he did and suffered voluntarily, such as circumcision, sorrow, fear, which are not absolutely a necessary consequence of the adopted human nature, as are growth and hunger.¹ (2) The whole tenor of the argument used by Honorius is equally in favor of this view, as he assumes that Christ really experienced the movements of his human will, that thus he was able to and did actually afford us an example of submission to the Divine Will, as also that he really prayed, and that he suffered in very fact and not in appearance only, and thus became to us our teacher and our example (1 Pet. ii. 21).

According to another explanation of this passage Honorius had in view simply the human will in Christ. This idea of its meaning is supported by the Roman abbot John, the Pope's secretary, whose words, "Unam voluntatem Domini diximus non divinitatis ejus et humanitatis, sed solius humanitatis," are mentioned by the Abbot Maximus. Maximus also asserts in another place that Honorius was an opponent of the Monothelites.

Pope John IV. (640-642) sustains the same view of the subject under discussion, when he says: "Confitemur unam voluntatem in sanctae ipsius dispensationis humanitate et non duas contrarias mentis et carnis praedicamus . . . secundum *hunc igitur modum*, jam dictus decessor noster (scilicet Honorius) praenominato Sergio Patriarchae percontanti scripsisse dignoscitur," etc. To this interpretation of the meaning of the words it is however objected, that this sentence is connected by the particle "unde" (*ōθεν*) with the preceding exposition of the divine and human nature and their operation; and that, as the question of Sergius did not refer to two

¹ See Epiph. Hoer. 39, 59; and Aug. Civ. Dei, xiv. 9, 3.

human wills, the Pope had no reason to speak as if of the human will alone.

The opinion that Honorius considered the will to be an effluence from the personality, and consequently only one in Christ, the human having been absorbed in the divine, is disposed of by the passages above cited, and by the admonition of the Pope to speak neither of the one nor of the other.

In the Catholic sense of the moral or rather the hypostatic union of the two wills in Christ, the expression “una voluntas” could be used by the Pope without involving the Monothelite error. It had already been used in this sense by Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom. Honorius insisted that Christ should be acknowledged as perfect God and perfect man, though he expressed himself obscurely and inaccurately in his first answer to Sergius. Therefore the failure of Honorius consisted in this: (1) That he did not closely examine into the drift of the controversy, but, deceived by Sergius, was led to consider the whole affair as a mere war of words; (2) That he made use of the expression “una voluntas,” which might be construed in an heretical sense, and was so construed by the Monothelites; (3) That by his admonition not to use either *μία* or *δύο ἐνέργειαι* as a formula (the sense of which was, however, not as yet determined), and to avoid all discussion, he gave up the correct orthodox expression, and indirectly aided heresy, inasmuch as the Monothelites always boasted that they were in harmony with the Apostolic See.

The second no less important question is how to explain the circumstance of the anathema passed upon Honorius by the Sixth Ecumenical Council.

Here it must be mentioned that the Oriental bishops assembled at Constantinople (1) rejected the letters of Sergius and of Honorius as “omnino alienas (*ἀλλοτρίας*, foreign, but in no way contradicting) ab apostolicis dogmatibus et definitionibus sanctorum conciliorum” . . . and as “sequentes falsas doctrinas haereticorum,” and branded them as “animaee noxias.”¹ (2) Together with Sergius and others, they anathematized the Pope himself “eo quod invenimus per scripta, quae ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus ejus mentis secutus est, et impia dogmata confirmavit, *κυρώσαντα*,”² and (3) They called Honorius a “heretic” by whose instrumentality the devil had diffused heresy.³

From these passages which we have just cited it can neither

¹ Harduin, iii. 1354.

² Ibid. 1334.

³ Ibid. 1386, 1398.

be affirmed nor denied that the bishops of Constantinople regarded and condemned Honorius as a formal heretic. But that they did not intend to judge that he was an adherent of the Monothelite heresy is gathered (*a*) from the circumstance that they state (*Actio 13*) that Sergius and others had been anathematized, "ut pote contraria rectae fidei nostrae sentientes," and hereupon first mention the Pope with the words given above, "eo quod invenimus," etc. (*b*) Stronger yet are the words of the Emperor Constantine, who, while confirming the decrees of the council, says of Honorius: "Ad haec (anathematizamus) Honorium horum (sel. Sergii, etc.) haereseos in omnibus fautorem, concursorem, confirmatorem,"¹ by which a great distinction is made between Sergius, etc., and the Pope Honorius.

When, then, the bishops called Honorius a heretic, it is not to be understood that he was a real heretic, as this name is also applied to those who have in any way favored a heresy, — for example, to Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus, at the Council of Chalcedon. Nor does the sentence that he was the instrument of the Devil in scattering heresy prove that the Pope was himself a heretic, because he could contribute to the spread of heresy by neglecting his duties and by omitting to proceed against the heresies, as was the case with Honorius.

It is, however, of minor importance for the answering of our question, to state in what sense it was that the bishops of the Council of Constantinople condemned Pope Honorius; for their judgment is by no means the judgment of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, as only those decrees which are, and as far as they are, confirmed by the Pope, have the force and authority of an ecumenical council.

The papal confirmation was given by Leo II. (682-683) in these words: "Pariterque anathematizamus novi erroris inventores, i. e. Theodorum, etc., nec non et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est," which in Greek stands thus, *παρέχώρησε*, the meaning of which is "subverti permisit," which is quite a different affair. Therefore Honorius was not condemned as a heretic, but as one who had favored heresy in the above-named sense. It is in this sense also that Leo speaks in his letter to the Spanish bishops, and in another letter to King Ervig: "Omnes haereticae assertionis auctores . . . i. e. Theodorus, etc.,

¹ *Harduin*, iii. 1458.

Cyrus Alexandrinus, Sergius . . . et una cum eis Honorius, qui immaculatam Apostolicae traditionis regulam quam a praedecessoribus suis accepit maculari consensit.”¹

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

§ 66. *Holy Baptism, Confirmation, and Eucharist.*

THE rite of baptism was enriched by several expressive and symbolic ceremonies, such as the breathing on the catechumens after the exorcism, the smearing the ears with spittle while uttering the word “Ephpheta,”² making the sign of the cross on the forehead and on the breast. When the catechumen renounced Satan he turned to the left; which done, he faced about to the east and swore fidelity to Christ. The catechumens held lighted tapers in their hands, and were clad in white robes (*λευκαιμονοῦτες*, “in albis incedentes.” “Dominica in albis.”³)

Gregory Nazianzen rebuked those mothers who postponed the baptism of their children out of regard to their tender state.

Godfathers are mentioned in the second century.

The sacrament of confirmation⁴ was often administered separately from baptism. In the East priests also might administer this sacrament. In the West they could do so only by a special privilege granted by the Pope in exceptional cases;⁵ even then the holy chrism was to be consecrated by the bishop.

Concerning the Holy Eucharist, although the Fathers, so long as the observance of the Discipline of the Seeret was obligatory on them, were obliged to be very cautious in their discourses before the catechumens, etc., yet they express themselves on this subject with

¹ Concerning this controversy compare *Nat. Alex.* Saec. VII. diss. 2. who passes the following judgment on Honorius: “Concludamus (1) Hon. a. 6 Syn. damnatum non fuisse *ut haereticum* sed *ut haereseos et haereticorum fautorem*, utque reum negligentiae in illis coercendis,” and (2) “Hon. eum Sergio . . . Monothelitis locutus est, sed *mente Catholica et sensu ab eorum errore penitus alieno*, siquidem absolute duas voluntates Christi non negavit, sed voluntates pugnantes.” *Pennachi, De Honorii I. Rom. Pontif. causa in Conc. VI. Ratisbonae, 1870. Palma, Praelectiones hist. eccl. (ed. iv.) i. 296 sqq.*

² Mark vii. 33, 34. On the use of salt in baptism, see *Aug. Conf.* i. 9. On baptism and its rites, see *Cyrill. Catech.* 19 and 20 (mystag. 1, 2).

³ *Cyrill. Catech.* 19 and 20 (mystag. 1, 4).

⁴ *Ibid.* 21.

⁵ *Morin. De sac. confirm. diss.* 2.

such clearness and precision that there can hardly be a doubt as to their faith. They inculcate particularly the real presence of Christ, transubstantiation, and the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist.¹

Liturgies, some of which date from the apostolic age, were introduced for the worthy solemnization of the Holy Mass. Among the Oriental liturgies some bear the names of the apostles; but it by no means follows that they have come down from them to the present day unchanged in form.

The liturgies of St. Basil and of St. Chrysostom, which are still in use in the Greek Church, have undergone considerable variations in the course of time.

The heretical and schismatic sects of the East — the Nestorians, Monophysites, Monothelites, and the like — also have their peculiar liturgies, which for the most part are transformations of Catholic liturgies.

Among the liturgies of the West, the Roman takes the first rank in age and dignity. Besides this, the Ambrosian liturgy was used in Milan; the Gothic or Mozarabic, in Spain. Akin to these the Gallic and the Anglican liturgies were also in use, though gradually these came to be replaced by the Roman. Only the Ambrosian rite continued to be followed in Milan. Cardinal Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo, was very solicitous for the preservation of the Mozarabic rite.

The celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice took place in the following manner :² —

The “Missa Catechumenorum” consisted of the Introit, Kyrie, Gloria, and the Pax Vobis of the bishop, with the Collects. Then, when the bishop had seated himself upon his throne, a passage from

¹ La perpétuité de la foi touchant l'eucharistie. Schwane. H. of Dogm. ii. 988. Of special importance are *Cyrill.* Catech. 22 and 23 (mystag. 4, 5). According to him, we become, by means of the Holy Eucharist, σύσσωμοι καὶ σύναψιοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ (n. 1). For transubstantiation, he brings forward the changing of water into wine at Cana, by Christ, and then asks : Οὐκ ἀξιόπιστός ἐστιν, σὸν μεταβαλὼν εἰς αἷμα (n. 2). We receive in the eucharist the body and blood of Christ : Ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτον δίδοται σοι τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἶνον δίδοται σοι τὸ αἷμα (n. 3). In Catech. 23 *Cyrill.* (mystag. 5), the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist is very clearly expressed : Εἶτα μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ θλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν θεον, κ. τ. λ. (n. 8). *Gregory of Nazianzen* calls the Holy Eucharist ἀναίμακτος θυσία (Orat. iv. c. 52). *Ambrose* styles it “hostia et sacrificium” (Enarr. in Ps. xxxviii. n. 25). Likewise, *Jerome* (Dial. cont. Pelag. iii. 15).

² The Oriental and Occidental liturgies agree in all essential points.

the Old or New Testament was read; when after this a Psalm had been sung, the Gospel was read aloud by the deacon, on which the bishop made some apt and instructive remarks (*όμιλία*, “tractatus”). Then the catechumens were dismissed, and the “Missa Fidelium” commenced.

The faithful brought forward their gifts, from which the deacon set aside that part which was necessary for the celebration of the Mass; this was then consecrated to God by prayer, blessed and offered to God (“offertorium”).

Then, the bishop having washed his hands, the faithful were prepared for the proper celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice by a special prayer (*πρόλογος*, *εὐχαριστία*, “praeфatio”), which exhorted the faithful to raise their hearts to God. It was closed by the Trisagion.

In the East the kiss of peace was given immediately before the preface; in the West, however, the time to give it was shortly before communion.

Now began the most solemn part of the Mass (*ἀναφορά*, “actio,” “secretum”), called, since Gregory the Great, the Canon. This consists of several prayers, after which the consecration took place. In the Greek liturgies a special invocation of the Holy Ghost over the sacred gifts follows the words of consecration.

In the East the consecrated Host was elevated for adoration before communion. The elevation of both species immediately after consecration was first introduced in the West, in the eleventh century. But the adoration of the Holy Eucharist immediately before receiving also took place here.

After the consecration followed the prayers for the living and the dead, with others (the Pater noster, Agnus Dei, and the like), after which the celebrating bishop, then the priests, deacons, etc., received the holy communion. After the communion the faithful were dismissed with the bishop’s blessing.

As preparation for holy communion it was necessary to be purified from grievous sins, to be fasting, and to have the hands washed.

Receiving communion under both species was also customary at this epoch, though daily communion was falling so much into disuse that the Fathers had often seriously to expositulate on the luke-warmness and negligence betrayed by the faithful in receiving the sacrament of the altar.

In the Greek Church, the Mass of the Presanctified (“Missa Prae-

sanctificatorum," *προηγιασμένων*) was celebrated every day during Lent, with the exception of Saturday and Sunday. In the Latin Church, it was only on Good Friday that this peculiar liturgy was used.

I. The single lessons were called *περικοπά*, *τμήματα*. Instead of the "lectio continua" of whole books, special paragraphs were selected. The Greeks have, with the exception of certain festivals, retained the consecutive reading of the four Gospels. The lessons were either marked out in the codices of Holy Scripture, or the extracts placed together in a separate book (see N. ii. 2).

The sermon took place not only at Mass, but also at the other religious services. Besides the bishop, presbyters also preached; monks might not preach in the church, though they were permitted to do so in the open air; laymen were forbidden to preach, though there were exceptions to this.¹ The preacher was seated; the people for the most part stood. A peculiar custom of olden times existed in the practice of receiving applause from the hearers (*κρότος*, "acclamatio," "applausus").² The sermons were often written down after being delivered. The bishop preached either from the altar or from his throne, or, like the presbyters, ascended the pulpit (*βῆμα*, rostrum). In large churches the sermon was frequently preached from a round elevated place called the "ambo;" it commenced and closed with prayer. Besides the homilies, "sermones panegirici" on the Blessed Virgin, the holy martyrs, etc., were customary. For the catechumens special instructions were given. Free discourses (*λόγοι στρέψιοι*) were also in use.

II. The principal liturgical books for the East and the West were:—

(1) The *εὐχολόγιον*, "saecamentarium," which contains the rite for Holy Mass, the administration of the sacraments, and the benedictions; (2) The Lesson-books, in which passages from the Old Testament (*ἀναγνώσεις*) and the New (*ἀπόστολος*, "epistolarium," "apostolus") were arranged for use according to the day, for the readers; (3) The Evangile, or Book of the Gospels ("textus," "textevangelium"), which contained the text of one or of the four ("plenarium") Gospels, or only such portions as were assigned for religious services (see Note 1); (4) The Comes, a catalogue of the different lessons, the authorship of which is ascribed to St. Jerome; (5) The Diptychs (*δίπτυχον*, "bis plicatum;" *δέλται*, "tabellae"), which were tablets

¹ *Eus.* H. E. vi. 19; *Cone.* Carthag. iv. c. 90.

² Cf. *Eus.* vii. 30. *Chrys.* Hom. 30 in act. apost. *Aug.* Hom. 50, Serm. 45 de temp.

covered with wax, on which the names of the Popes, bishops, princes, benefactors, etc., were inscribed, for whom a commemoration was to be made at Holy Mass. There were distinct tablets, δ. ζόντων and δ. νεκρῶν.¹ Others, as Card. Bona² and Salig,³ speak of three kinds of diptychs. (6) There were other liturgical books, called the Antiphonary, Gradual, and Psaltery. (7) The “Officia sanctorum” was arranged according to months (*μηναῖα*). The menology (*μηνολόγια*) of the Greeks corresponds to the martyrology of the Latins. (8) The “Missale speciale,” which is of a later date, contained all the prayers, lessons, etc., for Holy Mass. Concerning other liturgical books, see *Krazer*, *De apostolicis neenon antiquis eccl. liturgiis*. Aug. Vindel. 1786. *Daniel*, *Codex liturg.* iv. 1, 314 sqq. On the Greek liturgical books, see *Leo Allatius* (+ 1669), *Dissert. de libris eccl. Græc.* Paris, 1664.

§ 67. *Penance.—Extreme Unction.—Ordination.—Matrimony.*

With regard to the administration of the sacrament of penance, no essential change was made. The Fathers of this period, as of the last, taught (1) The power of the Church to remit all sins; as also (2) The necessity of a special confession of such sins before the priest.

On the other hand, the penitential discipline underwent some change. The severity of former times was moderated. Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople in 390, abolished the office of penitentiary, since which time the public confession of, and penance for, secret sins has been discontinued in the East, whilst the public confession of sins openly committed and known to the world was still retained.

To establish, as far as possible, a uniform practice in the administration of this sacrament, some enlightened bishops composed special instructions; at a later date penitential books, or books of penance, came into use, the most ancient of which were compiled in the West (“*Poenitentiale Romanum*,” etc.).

In the East public penitents were reconciled to the Church on Holy Thursday; while in Spain this took place on Good Friday or Holy Saturday.

As in former times, canonical penance was for special reasons

¹ *Gori*, *Thesaur. de vet. diptych.* 3 voll. fol. Florent. 1759.

² *Rer. liturg.* ii. 12, 260, d. episcoporum.

³ *De diptych. vet. eccl. Halla*, 1731, d. sanctorum et martyrum.

remit ted in part; it was very seldom altogether dispensed with. Besides the temporary excommunication, the *ἀράθεμα* also—that is, the major excommunication or total exclusion from the Church—took place.

The “Sacramentarium Gregorianum” contains explicit instructions on the administration of extreme unction (“unguentum sanctum,” “unctio,” *εὐχέλαυρον*) and concerning the rite of blessing the oil for the sick.

The rite of ordination was enriched by some profoundly solemn ceremonies. Prayer, and the laying on of hands¹ (*χειροτονία*) by the bishop, were considered essential in conferring the higher orders. The anointing at the ordination of a priest or bishop was introduced in the West, only at a later date. The ember days were more especially set apart for ordination. Those who were to be ordained prepared themselves by prayer and fasting.

The sanctity and dignity of Christian marriage was defended by the Fathers against the Gnostic-Manichean heretics; its relative position to virginity was also discussed. The civil legislation regarding marriage conformed itself more and more to that of the Church, without, however, agreeing in every point. Marriages between Christians and infidels (“infideles”) and between Catholics and heretics were forbidden, yet they sometimes took place. Adultery was considered a sufficient ground for separation; the separated were strictly forbidden to marry again. Espousals or betrothal preceded marriage.

In the West the solemnization of the marriage usually took place during Mass; in the East it was often performed in the house of the betrothed pair. Marriage was solemnized with peculiar and edifying rites and ceremonies.

§ 68. *Churches and their Ornaments.—Liturgical Vestments.*

After the conversion of Constantine the Great, the liberality of the imperial family and the generosity of the faithful caused the erection of numerous churches which were most magnificently adorned. The basilicas (*στοά βασιλικαῖ*) were not without their influence on the style of church-building in the West. In the sixth century the cupola form prevailed in the East, the most perfect model of which is the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, which was built by order of Justinian I. in a style of which he

¹ *Const. Apost.* viii. 16.

boasted that he had surpassed Solomon in magnificence. The churches were usually constructed in the form of an oblong quadrangle, and consisted of the front court, the nave, and sanctuary.

The front court (*πρόναος νάρθηξ*) was divided into an outer (*αὐλὴ*) uncovered ("locus hiemantium") court, and into an inner one, which was connected with the nave by three doors, of which the middle one was termed the royal or beautiful gate (*πύλαι βασιλικαὶ* or *ώραῖαι*).

The nave (*ναῦς, ναός*) was usually divided into three parts, separated from each other by a wall, a wooden partition, or a grating. The south side of the nave was occupied by the men; the north side, by the women.

The nave was joined to the choir, which consisted of the lower choir and of the higher (*αὐλτα τὰ ἀγία τῶν ἀγίων*, "sanctuarium," "adytum," the holy of holies).

The lower choir was raised by a few steps higher than the nave; it served for the chanters (*ῳδέτοις*) and the lower orders of clergy. Before it stood the ambon (*ἀναβαῖνω, ἀμβων*, "pulpitum"), and later two reading-desks for the Epistle and Gospel.

The upper choir, the sanctuary, was separated from the lower by a grating (*κυγκλίδες*, "cancelli"), or by a curtain, or by the sacred doors (*θύραι ἀγιαὶ, — εἰκονόστασις*). It was in the form of a semicircle (*ἄψις*) or of a shell (*κόγχη*), and contained the altar (*θυσιαστήριον, ἀγια τραπέζα*), behind which stood the bishop's throne (*θρόνος*), flanked on each side by the seats for the priests (*σύνθρονοι*).

The altar was covered with several linen cloths. Upon it, or sometimes near it, stood the cross; it was at a later date that the crucifix came into use. Lighted tapers increased the solemnity of the divine service. At first the altars were made of wood; afterwards stone was used for them. The altar was surmounted by a canopy (*κιβώτον*, "umbraculum"), resting on four columns, on the sides of which curtains ("tetravela") of costly material were often hung, thus veiling the altar. From the height of this canopy was suspended the dove-shaped vessel (*περιστήριον*) in which the Blessed Sacrament was reserved.

In the earliest times each church had but one altar; but since the fourth century several altars have been erected in the same church. The custom of building altars over the graves of the martyrs, or of enclosing the relics of the saints within them, dates back to Christian antiquity.

To the left of the altar was the *πρόθεστις*, or the "oblationarium;" to the right, the *διακονικόν*, or the "sacristia."

The consecration of churches, in which the neighboring bishops took part, was performed with great solemnity. This often gave occasion to the holding of a synod.

Magnificent frescos and mosaics (*λιθοστράτια*) adorned the interior of churches. The great significance of pictorial representations was demonstrated at the time of the iconoclastic controversy by popes, bishops, and priests.

The faithful were summoned to divine service by the *θεο-* or *ἀραδρόμοι* ("cursores"), or by the *σήμαντροι* (signal) and the *ἄγιοστιδηροι* ("saerum ferrum"); bells ("nolae," "campanae") were introduced in the West after the seventh century; in the East, after the ninth.

The more important churches had several adjoining buildings, as the baptistery, in which instruction to the catechumens was also given, and the secretarium ("locus secretus") or great diaconicum, in which the sacred vessels and treasures of the Church were kept, and where complaints against the clergy were examined and sometimes synods were held.

The clergy when performing their religious functions wore vestments specially dedicated to that purpose, the form of which was not to be distinguished from their ordinary dress; the color of these vestments was white, whence arose the present ecclesiastical vesture.

The ecclesiastical chant was at first symphonic; that is, it was performed by all the faithful in common. Later on it became antiphonic, or alternate, and hypophonic, in which the people responded to the intonings, lessons, and prayers of the clergy.

For the cultivation of the ecclesiastical chant in the West, Pope Silvester founded a singing-school at Rome in 330. St. Ambrose was a special encourager of this chanting; his own melodies ("cantus Ambrosianus") and poetical hymns are deeply affecting.

The real author of the Gregorian or Ecclesiastical Chant ("cantus primus") is Pope Gregory the Great, who also invented the notes called the neumen, pneumatic scale (*νεῦμα, πνεῦμα*).

Singing-schools arose in many places. In the third century special singers (*ψαλται*) were appointed; and then, more or less, the people ceased to take part in the chanting.

Besides the Psalms, hymns and songs of praise were often sung; the use of these dates back to the earliest antiquity, although there was no uniform practice in the matter.

It was even a frequent custom with the heretics, who seduced the Christians by their songs to induce certain Fathers to compose

orthodox hymns, some of which were afterwards admitted into the ecclesiastical liturgy.

I. Among the most noted composers of sacred hymns were St. Ephraem in Syria (§ 54), the presbyter Isaac of Antioch (fifth century), and Bishop Jacob of Sarug (+ 521). Among the Greek poets the following acquired no slight celebrity: Clement of Alexandria (§ 54), Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Sinesius (§ 54), Patriarch Sophronius, and the Abbot Maximus (§ 65), besides the three "saintly singers"—Cosmas of Jerusalem (+ 780), John of Damascus (+ 780), Theophanes (about 845), and others.

The most prominent Latin poets were Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine (§ 55), the Spaniard Juvencus (+ 330),¹ Pope Damasus (+ 384), the Scotchman Caelius Sedulius (about 490), Prudentius Clemens (+ 405), Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia (+ 521), Venantius Fortunatus (+ about 600), Gregory the Great, etc.

II. Among the most ancient liturgical vestments which are still in use are the alb ("vestis alba," *ποδήρης, στοι-* or *στιχάριον*,² which shortened becomes the surplice ("super-pellicium"), the girdle or cord ("cingulum," *ζώνη*), the stole (*ἱερὰ στολή*),³ and the chasuble ("casula," "paenula," "plena," *φανόλης, sel. χίτων, φελώνιον*). The amict ("humeral") and the maniple ("sudarium," "fanon") did not come into use before the eighth century, and then only in the West. The bracelet or sleeve-holder (*ἐπιμαρίκια*) of the Greeks was not introduced among the Latins. The sticharion of the deacon corresponds to our dalmatic. It is of the same color as the phelonion of the priest. Over the sticharion the deacon wears the stole (*ώράριον*) on the left shoulder. The priest's stole (*ἐπιτραχιλῖον*), the two parts of which are joined together, is put round the neck.

The bishops or archbishops of the East wear, as a distinctive robe of office, the *σάκκος*, a costly vestment without sleeves, fitting close to the body and hanging down to the soles of the feet; little silver bells are often affixed to this vestment.

The *ἀμφόριον* ("pallium"), which at first was made of sheep's wool, but is now composed of silk or other costly material, is worn over the shoulders. The *ἱπο-* or *ἐπιγονάτιον* is a quadrangular shield, hanging down from the girdle to the knee, made of velvet or silk, with a cross embroidered in the middle. The crosier (*ῥάβδος*) and a cross (*παναγίον*) on the breast also belong to the bishop's style and dignity.

In the West the tunicella and dalmatic were added to the bishop's clerical garments, as also the cross on the breast ("pectoral"). the

¹ Hist. Evang. lib. iv.

² Cf. *Eus. H. E.* x. 4.

³ Cf. *Theod. H. E.* ii. 27.

mitre (which is also used in the East), the ring, and crosier. On solemn occasions the bishop took his seat on the faldistorium.

III. Among the sacred vessels were the chalice, frequently of precious metal, the paten ("patena," *δίσκος*), and the corporal (*ειλητόν*).

§ 69. *Veneration of Saints.—Pilgrimages and Processions.*

The adoration paid to the saints ("cultus Sanctorum"),¹ which is so deeply rooted alike in the Christian religion as in the nature of man, always found expression in the Church: (1) In the veneration and invocation of the holy angels, martyrs, and confessors; (2) In the erection of chapels and basilicas in honor of the martyrs, in which their reliques were deposited, and their memory annually celebrated; (3) In exposing the images of saints in the churches, public places, and in private houses; (4) In venerating their reliques and all things that had ever come in proximate contact with them.

But it is with a very special and particular enthusiasm that the ancient Fathers speak of the privileges of the Holy Mother of God, and of the position which she occupies in the economy of salvation. They defend her high dignity and virginity against the Antidikomarianites,² and against the blasphemies of Jovinian,³ Helvidius,⁴ and Bonosus of Sardica.⁵ But with the same zeal they crush out all such idolatrous worship of Mary as was practised, for example, among the Collyridians (*κολλύριοις*) in Arabia.⁶ To hinder all erroneous veneration of the saints, and to refute at the same time the absurd objections of Vigilantius and others to the worship of saints, the Fathers show at large and clearly the reasons which justify the veneration and invocation of saints;⁷ and also fully explain the important distinction which exists between the *λατρεία* (*latraria*), the

¹ *Aug.* c. Faust. xx. 21. *Populus Christianus memorias martyrum religiosa solemnitate concelebret et ad exercitandam imitationem, et ut meritis eorum consocietur atque orationibus adjuvetur.* Cf. *Serm.* cclxxx. 6. *Miramur eos, misereantur nos. Gratulamur eis, precantur pro nobis.*

² *Epiph.* Haer. 78.

³ *Hieron.* Adv. Jovinian. t. ii. col. 238 sqq., ed. Vallars.

⁴ *Hieron.* Adv. Helvid. ii. 205 sqq.

⁵ *Ambros.* De instit. virg. c. 5.

⁶ *Epiph.* Haer. 79.

⁷ *Aug.* Enchirid. c. 56: *Haec (eccl. coelestis) in sanctis angelis beata persistit et suae parti peregrinanti, sicut oportet, opitulatur: quia utraque una erit consortio aeternitatis, et nunc una est vineculo caritatis, quae tota instituta est ad colendum unum Deum.* *Hieron.* Adv. Vigilant. : *Si apostoli et martyres adhuc in carne constituti possunt orare pro caeteris, quando pro se adhuc debent esse solliciti, quando magis post coronas, victorias, triumphos.*

homage which is due to God alone, and the *δοντεία*, or veneration paid to the saints as the beloved friends of God.¹

The cycle of ecclesiastical festivals was at this period increased by the addition of several feasts of Christ and of the saints, some of which were at first celebrated in particular churches only, but afterwards became generally adopted.

To the festivals of our Lord, already established, were now added the feast of the Ascension, of the Circumcision, and the Transfiguration of Christ, with the feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross by St. Helena (fourth century), and the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (in the year 629).

As the forty days' fast and the great week (*εβδομὰς μεγάλη*) preceded the feast of Easter, it was also now thought fitting that the time of Christmas should be preceded by a preparatory fast, and thus came the institution of Advent.

The feasts of the Blessed Virgin, which had been introduced at a very early date both in the East and the West, are those of the Annunciation (*ἡ τοῦ εναγγελισμοῦ*) and the Purification, also called the Presentation, from the presenting Christ in the Temple ("purificatio," "præsentatio;" by the Greeks named *ἱπαπάντη*, "occursus." Luke ii. 22); and the birth and assumption of Mary (*κοίμησις, ἀνάληψις*) had already been kept as festivals.

Among the holy angels St. Michael was specially venerated, while superstitious worship of angels was carefully guarded against and strictly forbidden. The most celebrated of the Saints' feasts were those of St. Stephen, of the innocent children of Bethlehem ("flores martyrum"), of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, the Cathedra (throne) of St. Peter (fest. cathedrae Petri, Rom.: 18th January; Antioch: 22d February), and St. Peter's chains; the birthday and beheading of St. John the Baptist; the feast of the Maccabean brothers, the feast of St. Lawrence in the West, etc. The feast of all the holy martyrs (*κυριακὴ τῶν ἀγίων πάντων*) was celebrated in the East, on the first Sunday after Pentecost, as early as the fourth century; and the feast of All Saints was introduced in the West by Pope Boniface IV. (608-615).

The veneration of images and pictures is but a natural consequence of the worship of saints. The most ancient of the Fathers pictured to themselves Christ, the man of sorrows, as of an ugly and un-

¹ *Aug.* c. Faust. xx. 21: *Ilo cultu, quae Graece latria dicuntur, Latine uno verbo dici non potest, cum sit quaedam proprie divinitati debita servitus, nec colimus, nec calendum docemus, nisi unum Deum.* Cf. *Civ. Dei*, v. 15, x. 1.

seemly appearance. After the conversion of Constantine the Savior was represented as the ideal beauty. One of the oldest statues of Christ was the statue at Cæsarea Philippi (Panæas). Among the so-called *εἰκόνες ἀχειροποίητοι* (images, or pictures not made by hands) those of Abgar and Veronica are the most famous. There existed, also, representations of the Blessed Virgin and of the apostles, of which we will mention only the statue of St. Peter in Rome.

Some few individuals, it is true, were not only averse to the custom of embroidering commemorative scenes from the life of Christ and the saints in their clothing, but also declared themselves against images, pictures, and the veneration paid to them. These were ably refuted by others who, while they spoke warmly against every misuse of image worship, defended the proper veneration due to them.

But even more than pictures, the relics of the saints and the instruments of the Passion of Christ became the object of pious veneration, which God not unfrequently rewarded with incontrovertible miracles.

The most precious of the sacred reliques was that of the true Cross of Christ, which was discovered at Jerusalem by St. Helena, mother of Constantine the Great, in 326. Many churches received particles of it. Several ecclesiastical and imperial laws were published against the misdemeanor of selling or stealing reliques.

The places in which the Savior had lived and worked, or in which the earthly reliques of the apostles and other saints were deposited, also received veneration from the faithful.

Already in the earliest times Christians made pilgrimages to Jerusalem and other holy places of Palestine. They visited the graves of the apostles Peter and Paul at Rome ("limina apostolorum"), and the like. In the fourth century a stronger impulse to pilgrimages was given. The Holy Fathers praised and recommended the practice, which took its rise in the natural emotions and desires of the human heart;¹ but they sanctioned the pilgrimages only on condition that they were undertaken with a pure intention and conducted in a proper manner.²

The spirit of Christianity also manifests itself in processions which were known and practised already by the Jews and also by the pagans. During the persecutions these could not take place openly;

¹ Cf. *Chrys.* Hom. 8 in *Ep. ad Eph.*; Hom. 32 in *Ep. ad Rom.*; Hom. 30 in *Ep. ii. ad Cor.* *Paulin Nol.* Ep. 36: *Religiosa cupiditas est loca videre, in quibus Christus ingressus et passus est, et resurrexit et unde ascendit.*

² *Hieron.* Ep. 58 (ad *Paulin*): *Non Jerosolymis fuisse, sed Jerosolymis bene vixisse landandum est.* On the utility of pilgrimages, cf. Ep. 46.

but so much the more frequently did they occur after Constantine the Great had entered the Church. Processions took place chiefly on Palm Sunday (*βαῖα*) and Easter, but also occurred on other high-feast days, at the consecration of a church, etc. They were also used to avert great calamities. The processions of triumph and thanksgiving (*hosanna*) were very different from those of supplication and penitence (*λιταρεῖα*, *λιται*, “supplicationes,” “rogationes”). The three Rogations before the ascension of our Lord were introduced by Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne (450).

Gregory the Great mentions the procession on St. Mark's day. Clergy and laity took part in the processions in festival costume or penitential garb, according to the intention of the movement. Crosses and banners, statues, reliques, and lighted tapers contributed not a little to enhance the solemnity. Those who took part in the procession sang, alternately, hymns of praise, litanies (*κύριε ἐλέησον*), and other prayers.

§ 70. *Fasting-Days.—Charitable Institutions.—Christian Life.*

The want of uniformity which existed at a former period with regard to the observance of the fast of Lent was now much lessened, if not quite obliterated.¹ Besides this, certain days were also set apart as fast days in Advent. Leo the Great traces the ember days back to apostolic tradition. During the time of fasts Christians also abstained from meat (abstinence).

Besides bodily mortification prayer was considered as an indispensable means of sanctification, and was prescribed by the Church alike for the clergy as for the laity. Prayer, divided into canonical hours, is of very early antiquity. The Breviary owes its origin to this. It began with the nocturnal office, and was continued at the third, sixth, and ninth hour. The Apostolice Constitutions speak of five, and sometimes of seven hours of prayer. According to Cassian, this custom of regular prayer prevailed first in the monasteries of Palestine and of Mesopotamia, and at a later period spread to the East and West. Compline was added by St. Benedict of Nursia.

Mindful of the admonitions of the Savior, the Christians were ever solicitous for the spiritual and temporal welfare of their fellow-men; and as soon as outward circumstances in any way permitted

¹ Gregory the Great fixed Ash-Wednesday (*dies cinerum, caput jejunii*) to be the beginning of the Quadragesima fast.

them to do so, they founded various charitable institutions, — as poor and orphan houses, hospices for strangers, hospitals for the sick, refuges for the foundling, and the like. These benevolent measures called forth a glorious testimony of approbation even from the Apostate Julian. The founding, direction, and support of such establishments devolved on the bishops, who were frequently assisted in this labor of love by the Government.

What Christianity did for the abolition of slavery has already been pointed out (§ 46). The Christian spirit, seeing in every one the image of God and the object of his infinite love, powerfully contributed to effect this result.

With regard to the lives of Christians the Church is like a piece of land in which wheat and weeds grow up together; for, close to the ideal of Christian perfection which was beautifully realized at this epoch, there were many who were Christians in name only. The sect of the Rhetorians represented a religious indifferentism, while the Hypsistarians and other parties cherished a subjective eclecticism.

In opposition to the moral deficiencies on the one hand, and to the hypocritical conduct of many Christians on the other, several perverted souls fell into an extreme fanatical spiritualism. Such were the adherents of Audius (Udo), a Syrian layman of Mesopotamia (about 340), the followers of Adelphius, called Adelphians, Massalians, and Euchites, who, rejecting all outward works and the sacraments, relied solely on prayer. The Eustathians, so called from the Bishop of Sebaste (+ 376), in their immoderate rigorism, rejected matrimony, fasted on Sundays, and maintained other extreme doctrines.

Other sectaries held doctrines the direct converse of these, but equally erroneous and injurious. Such were those of Aërius of Sebaste, who denied the distinction between priest and bishop, and rejected fasting as well as prayer and alms for the dead.

Jovinian, a monk at Roine, with his comrades Helvidius and Vigilantius, who undervalued the life of virginity, of celibacy, and of monasticism, rejected asceticism in all its branches, impugned the veneration of saints and reliques, and set no value whatever on the spiritual life, — in fact, ignored it altogether.

All these false doctrines were refuted by the Fathers and condemned by the Church, which, adhering closely to the principles of true asceticism, opposed with equal vigor and strength the two extremes, in which lay alike the root and the fruit of these errors.

§ 71. *Monasticism.*

Though the Church now enjoyed exterior freedom, there were still many Christians who retired to the desert to devote themselves entirely to the service of God, in order that, undisturbed by worldly cares, they might strive after that higher perfection of spirit which in so many ways had disappeared even as an ideal from the world.

Such were the high motives that suggested the monastic life; and as monasticism sprang from the spirit of Christianity, it, in its turn, exercised a strengthening and vivifying influence upon the whole of Christendom.¹

The first monks lived as hermits (*έρημιται, ἀραχωρηται*); after a while they united under a common superior, and formed companies (confraternities, companionships), the members of which either dwelt in different cells (*Laura, λαύρα*) or in houses common to all (cloisters, *κοινόβιοι*).

The founder of monastic life is St. Anthony of Koma, in upper Egypt. After having distributed his large property he lived as a hermit for twenty years; then, without entirely forsaking his solitary life, he became the founder and the head of several cloisters. He died at the age of one hundred and five years (+ 356), with the reputation of having triumphantly defended the Church against infidels and heretics, and powerfully counteracted the tepidity of the age.

The new mode of life, which the ancients styled *βίος ἀγγελικός* (the angelic life) and also *φιλοσοφία ὑψηλή* (the highest philosophy), soon gained admirers and imitators.

Ammonius peopled the Nitrian desert with monks, and Pachomius, the founder of the Cenobites proper, established his first cloister on the Nile island Tabenna. Hilarion carried the monastic life into Palestine, and St. Basil the Great into Cappadocia, Pontus, etc. This last-named saint drew up the rules which became the foundation of monastic life in the East. In Persia monasticism was introduced as early as the fourth century. By degrees it spread over the whole East.

Monasticism became known in the West by means of St. Athanasius. It was zealously promoted by St. Eusebius of Vercelli, who had become acquainted with it during his exile in Thebais, and by St. Jerome.

St. Martin founded the first cloister in Gaul. When he became

¹ See Montalembert's *Monks of the West*.

Bishop of Tours he founded the famous abbey of Marmoutier ("magnum monasterium"), which was one of the most important monastic associations.

St. Ambrose and St. Augustine were also zealous promoters of monasticism. From Africa it was carried into Spain.

At the head of a monastery stood the abbot ($\alpha\beta\beta\hat{a}s\ \alpha\rho\chi\mu\alpha\delta\rho\iota\tau\eta s$, $\eta\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\omega\sigma$). Until the tenth century the monks were chiefly laymen, and every monastery had but one or more priests for the performance of divine service. Individual monasteries were under the jurisdiction of the bishop. In the fifth and sixth centuries the vows of obligation, binding the votary to poverty, chastity, and obedience, were introduced. Previous to this, the return to secular life, though always discouraged, was sometimes permitted. At this time, also, a certain age was determined on, and a time of trial (novitiate) appointed for candidates for admission into a monastery.

Among the various forms of monastic life the following deserve attention: (1) The Akoiometoi (the Sleepless) in the Cloister Studium at Constantinople, so named from the many vigils they kept; (2) The Sarabaites in Egypt, and Remobothi in Syria, who lived without definite rules, and, like the Gyrovagi in Italy and Africa, soon degenerated; and (3) The Stylites, whose severe and ascetic mode of life found few to imitate it.

The distinguished respect paid to the monks both by temporal and spiritual dignitaries, and the love manifested towards them by the people, are a brilliant refutation of the false accusations which even then attacked this glorious institution. But the significance of the monastic life in promoting the interests of the Church is evidenced by these facts: (1) The monasteries performed a large share of the work in the propagation and consolidation of Christianity; (2) Many of the most learned and pious priests and bishops came forth from the cloisters; (3) By their prayer and example in cultivating and in strengthening a true and genuine religious life among the clergy and laity, they did an inestimable and incommensurable service to Christianity in the world at large.

About the time of St. Anthony cloisters of women also were formed; these were even more ancient than those of the men. The superioress was called Ammas (Mother); the members were termed $\mu\omega\alpha\chi\alpha\iota$, "sanctimoniales," or nuns ("nonnae," "castae").

The monks first introduced the tonsure, i. e. the practice of having the hair shaved off, which from the sixth century was also adopted by the clergy. The Roman tonsure ("tonsurā Petri")

differed from the Oriental tonsure ("tonsura Pauli"). The Orientals shaved the entire head; the Western monks let a narrow crown of hair remain.¹

§ 72. *Retrospect.*

The result of the action of the Church during the first epoch is essentially as follows:—

The Church became developed into a world-empire, which embraced the civilized alike with the barbarous nations of the East and the West, and, tearing down the wall of division which towered between them, elevated them both to a higher, even to a supernatural unity.²

The actual accomplishment of the work compels us to acknowledge the divine power of the Christian religion the more distinctly when the difficulties are considered which stood in the way of the Church, and the tools with which she accomplished her task. History tells us that slaves, women, young people, boys and girls, were the instruments used by God to spread his truth, that the wisdom of the world might be brought to shame.³

The Church, proscribed and persecuted by the secular power, maintained her existence and gained her freedom through the blood of her martyrs, and at last changed her powerful enemies into sons and friends who aided in the blessed struggle for the truth, though sometimes, while intending to protect the kingdom of God, they encroached upon the rights they should have respected.

Such encroachments of despotic power would not indeed have been always followed by the disastrous effects that did occur, if all bishops had followed the example of St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Hilary, and others, who with apostolic candor and uprightness resisted the immoderate assumptions of worldly rulers.

The various heresies, the interior bond of union among which is the characteristic mark of denying the fundamental dogmas of Christianity, disturbing the authority of the Church, and surrendering her most sacred rights, may have been able by sophistry and intrigue to tear away a considerable number of the faithful from the heart of their mother, and to plunge them into destruction; yet inadvertently they rendered service to the Church by calling forth the master-works of the Holy Fathers, and causing the synods to be convoked in which the truth obtained so brilliant a triumph over falsehood.

¹ See *Thomassin*, *Vet. et nov. discipl.* 1. ii. c. 25 sqq.; *Martene*, *De antiq. eccl. ritibus*, 1. ii. cap. 7, art. 8 (ii. 294 sqq.).

² Eph. i. 14; cf. Gal. iii. 28.

³ 1 Cor. i. 26-29.

The controversy, it is true, was not set at rest when the individual errors in dispute had been overthrown. The many-shaped Proteus of heresy was in never-ceasing combat against the true and only Church, but finally, in spite of the protection of the secular power, it fell to pieces; while the Church that had been abandoned came out of the strife victorious, and erected her trophies of triumph on the very ruins of heresy itself.

What the Church has done for the spiritual reformation of mankind may be known without difficulty from the laws and institutions, as well as from the deeds by which she has civilized the nations, has promoted science and art, and has rendered them subservient to the glory of God.

Under the protection of the Church arose those celebrated institutions of learning in which, on the impregnable rock of faith, a Christian science flourished which was the admiration of the past generations, and continues to be the wonder of the present age. Art also received a higher impulse and development from the Church. The Church was solicitous for the temporal welfare of her children, as well as for their spiritual good; hence we see on all sides a variety of charitable institutions bearing witness to this incontestable fact.

But, above all, the Church endeavored to sanctify her members more and more, to lead them daily forward to the high and ultimate end of their being. Her influence made itself felt in the individual life, as in that of entire nations, and this in the wholesomest manner; from this influence resulted the Christian family life and Christian government, even if the chaff was still oftentimes mixed with the wheat.

The seventh century closes the first epoch, which embraces the action of the Church in the Greco-Roman Empire. Inhabitants of this empire had embraced the Christian faith with great enthusiasm, had clung to it despite the bloody persecutions with admirable perseverance, had triumphantly defended it against pagans and heretics, and had developed a form of religious worship worthy of the dignity and glory of Christianity. They now resign their station on the stage of history. Henceforward the Germanic races are to fill the places of the ancient Romans. The Western Church enters on a new mission, fraught with rich results.

On the other hand, the Eastern Church, after the termination of the Monothelite conflict, falls into the background, and gives but a few precarious, struggling, joyless signs of existence, until the unhappy schism opened an almost impassable gulf between itself and the Mother Church of Rome.

Second Epoch.

PERIOD I.

FROM THE MIGRATION OF NATIONS TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII. (1073).

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 73. *Migration of Nations.*

WHILST the Church in the East was perpetually engaged in violent conflicts with heresies as powerful as they were perverse, great political changes were taking place in the West. The Western Roman Empire was verging more and more to its decline. Rome¹ itself was repeatedly besieged, taken, and plundered, until at last Odoacer, King of the Heruli, hurled the last imperial phantom of a ruler from the throne (476).

The various nations who were thus instrumental in bringing about the downfall of the Western Empire of Rome, and who erected new kingdoms upon its ruins, caused no little suffering to the Church, though at the same time they opened to its zeal and enthusiasm a new and extensive field of action. The work now to be accomplished was one of peculiar difficulty. The task of the Church was no longer that of endeavoring to purify and perfect the elements of an existing and almost effete civilization; it was to overrule the barbarism of robust tribes, as yet unspoiled by effeminacy and untainted by the vices of civilized life. It was to do this by planting in their midst the germs of intellectual and moral training.² The diffusion

¹ *Reumont*, Hist. of the City of Rome. 1 vol. p. 737.

² *St. Jerome*, Ep. 123, to Agerich, thus expresses himself regarding the various people: Innumerabiles et ferocissimae nationes universas Gallias occuparunt. Quidquid inter Alpes et Pyrenaeum est quod Oceano et Rheno ineluditur, Quadus, Van-

of Christian truth thus stood in a necessary relation to the influence exercised by the Church on political and social life.

The Roman Empire, founded in paganism, was now rotten at the core. It scarcely retained the ability of being reformed; therefore, in the providence of God, it was permitted to pass away, while in the newly founded German Empire the ground was prepared in which the Church could lay the seed of improvement. The Germanic nations were thus the instruments by which the judgments of Divine Providence were executed on the corrupted inhabitants of the Empire in the West. But these same vanquished people, purified by struggle and hardship, were, together with their vanquishers, to become the recipients of a far higher, far nobler civilization.

And herein lies the significance of that migration of nations which, like a deluge, spread far and wide, overwhelming the ancient heathen civilization, destroying its pernicious effects,¹ but at the same time forming a starting-point for the new intellectual and moral development of mankind which Christianity carried in its teachings as the germ of a truer principle of progress.

§ 74. *Christianity among the Goths.—Condition of the Church in Gaul and Spain.*

The Goths, who on leaving the wilds of Scandinavia had settled on the left bank of the Danube (215) and divided themselves into two parties,—the Eastern, or Ostrogoths, and the Western, or Visigoths,—probably received their first knowledge of Christianity from Roman prisoners of war.² But during the reign of the Emperor

dalus, Sarmata, Halani, Gipedes, Heruli, Saxones, Burgundiones, Alemani, et o
lugenda respublica! hostes Pannonii vastarunt. “Etenim Assur venit cum illis.”
Moguntiacum, nobilis quondam civitas, capta atque subversa est, et in ecclesia multa
hominum millia trucidata. Vangiones longa obsidione deleti Remorum urbs praec-
potens, Ambiani, Atrebatae, extremique hominum Morini, Tornacus, Nemetae,
Argentoratus, translatae in Germaniam.

¹ Cf. *Aug. Civ. Dei*, i. 32, 33. *Salv. De gub. mundi*, vii. 1. *Totus Romanus* orbis et miser est, et luxuriosus. Qui, quaeso, pauper et nugax, qui captivitatem expectans, de cireo cogitat? Quis metuit mortem, et ridet? Nos et in metu captivitatis ludimus; et positi in mortis timore, ridemus. *Sardoniceis quodammodo herbis* omnem Romanum populum putes esse sativatum. Moritur et ridet. Et ideo in omnibus fere partibus mundi risus nostros lacrymae consequuntur.

² *Sozom.* ii. 6. According to *Sozom.* (ii. 41) the Gothic bishop Theophilus attended the Council of Nice; according to *Cyrill.* (Catech. 16), the Goths had bishops and priests, monks and nuns. Cf. *Athlan. De incarn. Verbi*, c. 51. .

Valens, who assigned them dwelling-places in Thrace and Mœsia, they, at the instigation of their bishop, Ulfila,¹ embraced the Arian heresy. The number of those who remained faithful to the Catholic faith, or returned to it after having departed from it, was very few.

Under the Emperor Arcadius, the Visigoths, headed by Alaric, marched into Italy and took Rome (410). They were, however, soon obliged to abandon their conquest, and went into Gaul, where they founded a new kingdom, the capital of which was Toulouse. This kingdom embraced a part of Gaul and of Spain.

The Catholic Church had much to suffer from some Arian Visigoth kings. King Euric (+ 483) was one of the chief enemies; according to Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Clermont, he appeared more like the head of a sect than the king of his subjects.

In Spain the Church was also grievously persecuted under King Leovigild (+ 586). He also destroyed the kingdom of the Catholic Suevi,² in the year 585. He went so far as to have his own son Hermenegild put to death for refusing to renounce the Catholic faith.³

Reccared, the second son of Leovigild, following the example of his brother, returned to the Catholic Church. The greater part of his people renounced Arianism with him. The king compelled

¹ *Socr.* iv. 33. *Sozom.* vi. 37. *Theod.* iv. 37. Concerning Ulfila, who invented a Gothic alphabet and translated the Holy Scriptures, with the exception of the Book of Kings, see *Philos.* H. E. ii. 5.

² According to *Gregory of Tours* (*De miraculis s. Martini*, i. 11, ap. *Migne*, tom. lxxi. 924), King Carrarie was the first Catholic king of the Suevi; according to *Isidor of Seville* (*Hist. Suevor.* ap. *Migne*, *Patr. lat.* tom. lxxxiii. 1082), it was his successor, Theodemir. The chief merit of their conversion is due to the saintly bishop Martin of Dumium, near Braga. In the year 563 a synod was held in Braga. See *Gams*, *Ch. Hist. of Spain*, ii. 1, 472 f.

³ Hermenegild had been converted by Leander, Bishop of Seville, and by Ingundis, his wife, a French princess. By this he incurred the hatred of his father, who, influenced by his second wife, Goswinthe, according to *Greg. Turon.* (l. c. v. 39), coepit causas querere, qualiter eum perderet. Cf. *Paul. Diae. de gestis longob.* iii. 21; *Greg. M. Dial.* iii. 31. By this it is possible that Hermenegild was compelled to take up arms (*Greg. Turon.* v. 39. Cf. vi. 43). This resistance was by some denominated rebellion (cf. *Isid. Hispal. Hist. Suevor.*); others termed it self-defence. The cause of the murder of Hermenegild was his refusal to receive communion from an Arian bishop (cf. *Greg. M. Dial.* iii. 33). Concerning the persecution of the Church under Leovigild, see *John Biclar* (since 592 Bishop of Gerona + after 600), who continued the Chronicle of *Victor Tunun* up to 590. Ed. *Canis. ap. Basnage*, Op. i. 337. *Migne*, *Patr. lat.* tom. lxxii. 863 sqq.

no one to embrace the Catholic religion, but he gave the best support in his power to the bishops who in the year 589 held the great national Council of Toledo; he also restored to the Church the property of which it had been robbed, and permitted the exiled Catholics to return.

The reign of King Wamba in Spain was injurious to the Church; he, in 680, rendered all the clergy liable to military service. No better was the rule of the cruel king Witiza, whose sons invited the Mahometans into Spain; and these soon made an end of the Empire of the Visigoths (711).

§ 75. *Condition of the Church among the Vandals in Africa.*

Setting out from the shores of the Baltic Sea, the Arian Vandals pursued through Gaul their way to Spain; but here they encountered the arms of the Visigoths, to which they were compelled to yield. They gladly therefore accepted the invitation of Boniface, the Roman general, to aid him in his attempt to gain his own independence; their king, Genseric, at the head of his wild and barbarous hordes, arrived in Africa¹ (429), and gradually made himself master of the whole of the Roman province of North Africa.

Genseric immediately commenced a furious persecution of the Catholics, especially of the bishops and priests, whom he either had put to death or sent into exile.² His son Huneric (477–484) at first tolerated the Catholics, and in 479 permitted them to elect an Archbishop of Carthage.³ Afterwards his disposition towards them was changed by the Arian bishop Cyril, and after the conference held at Carthage (484) the Catholics were threatened with the severest penalties. But the end sought by the tyrant was not thereby attained. The Catholics remained faithful. God himself glorified his Church during this sad time by working wonderful miracles at Tipasa, which are incontestably proved.

Under King Guntamund (+ 496) the lot of the Catholics was somewhat ameliorated. The exiled bishops were permitted to return home. But in 496–523 King Thrasamund renewed the old cruelties, and banished one hundred and twenty African bishops (among whom was Fulgentius of Ruspe) to Sardinia.

¹ The chief source of information is the *Hist. persec. Vandal.* of Victor, Bishop of Vita (487), ed. *Ruinart.* Paris, 1694. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. lviii.

² *Vict. Vita*, l. c. i. 1 sq.

³ The choice fell on Eugenius, a distinguished bishop (*Vict. Vita*, ii. 3).

Hilderic, son and successor to Thrasamund, restored peace to the Church. He was dethroned and assassinated by his cousin Gelimer (530). The Emperor Justinian then sent Belisarius with an army into Africa, and overthrew the dominion of the Vandals there in 534.

§ 76. *The Church among the Burgundians. — Ravages of the Huns.*

The Burgundians had dwelt on the Baltic Sea, whence they went to the Danube, then to the banks of the Main, the Neckar, and the Rhine. In the fifth century they were driven away from their settlements by the Huns, and founded a kingdom in Gaul of which Lyons became the capital. Though for the most part Arians¹ themselves, the Burgundians were not very hostile to the Church. Their king, Gundobald, even gave proofs of his good-will in its behalf by yielding to the wishes of St. Avitus and arranging a disputation between the Catholic and the Arian bishops, which was held at Lyons in the year 500. On this occasion Gundobald was convinced of the truth of the Catholic faith; but it was his son and successor Sigismund who first had the courage to make a public confession of his faith. After the Burgundians had passed under the dominion of the Franks (534), the last traces of Arianism disappeared from among them.

The most formidable of all the nations who took part in obliterating the ancient civilization were the Huns. Under Attila, their leader, a vast multitude left Pannonia (451) and overran Germany and Gaul. After the murderous battle of Chalons-sur-Marne, Attila led his hordes to Italy and threatened Rome; but, awed by the commanding attitude of Pope Leo the Great, who headed a procession to the camp of the invader, he left Italy and went back to Pannonia.

After the death of Attila the great kingdom of the Huns was dissolved, and the disbanded tribes rushed into the Christian countries, causing everywhere devastation and ruin. St. Severin, distinguished by the sanctity of his life and endowed with the gift of miracles, who was living in the neighborhood of Vienna, proved himself a great benefactor to the severely stricken inhabitants of Noricum (+ 482).

¹ According to *Oros* (vii. 32, 38) and *Socr.* (vii. 30), the Burgundians had been Catholics at first, and at a later date had fallen into Arianism.

§ 77. *Condition of the Church in Italy among the Ostrogoths and the Lombards.*

The government of the Heruli, who, under the leadership of Odoacer in 476, had put an end to the Roman Empire in the West, was but of short duration; for as early as 493 their kingdom was destroyed by Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths.¹

Under this powerful prince, who was himself an Arian, the Church was not persecuted, which is principally to be ascribed to the influence exercised by several distinguished men on Theodoric.

One of these men was Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boethius. He was a descendant of a noble Roman family, and stood in high repute with Theodoric, on account of his great learning. At length, however, he fell under the emperor's suspicion, and was first imprisoned, then put to death.

The Senator Marcus Aurelius Cassiodorus was scarcely less renowned than Boethius. He gained the favor of the king by his conduct in Sicily, and was appointed State Chancellor by him. In this position he frustrated many designs of his master which were hostile to religion, and saved the Church from a schism when the lawful Pope Symmachus was in conflict with the anti-Pope Laurence. Towards the end of his life Cassiodorus withdrew into retirement, and founded the Convent Vivarium, of which he became the abbot.

Scarcely less advantageous for religion was the work performed by the Scythian monk Dionysius Exiguus; and it is worthy of remark that the founding of the Order of St. Benedict took place in the time when the Ostrogoths held sway. During the last years of his life Theodoric became mistrustful of the Catholics; and many able men, among whom was Pope John, fell victims to his suspicions. It never came so far as a general persecution during his reign, because in August, 526, the king was called away from earth, before the edict of persecution which he had issued could take effect.

After the Ostrogoths had been defeated by Narses, the commander-in-chief of the army of the Emperor Justinian, Italy became (555) a province of the East Roman Empire. Not long to remain so, however. Already, in the year 568, the Lombards, under Alboin (from Pannonia), had conquered a great part of the land.

¹ *Jordan.* *De reb. Geticis.* ap. *Murat.* *Script. rer. Ital.* i. 1, 191 sqq. *Migne, Patr. lat.* tom. lxix. 1252 sqq. *Procop.* *De bello Gothic.* ap. *Murat.* *Script. rer. Ital.* i. 1, 247 sqq.

Under the dominion of this cruel people who were so much abhorred by the natives, a people who were addicted in part to idolatry and in part adhered to Arianism, the Church found itself in a very deplorable condition, which became even worse when the death of Alboin brought anarchy in its train.

Nor, when order was re-established, did the persecution of the Catholics cease. King Autharis oppressed the Church, even though his queen Theodolinda (Dietlinde), a Bavarian princess, belonged to it. The persecution did not end till King Agilulph, the second husband of Theodolinda, ascended the throne. Throughout this fearful time the chief merit in upholding the Church is due to Gregory the Great, who then sat on the papal throne.

After the death of Agilulph some kings favored Arianism again, and it was not till the reign of King Grimoald (+ 671) that the Catholic religion became the ruling faith of the land.

§ 78. *Conversion of the Franks.*

Among all the Germanic tribes, the Franks — divided into two branches, the Salii and the Ripuarii — bear the palm as having been the first to embrace the Catholic religion, and as having ever since adhered to that religion more strictly than any other race. Clovis, their king, was prepossessed in its favor by Clotilda, his wife, a Burgundian princess; he having, as he believed, obtained a victory over the Alemanni, near the town of Tolbiacum, or Zülpich (496), in answer to a prayer he had addressed to Clotilda's God, that is, the God of the Christians. Clovis received baptism at the hands of St. Remigius, Bishop of Rheims; and his example excited a large number of the nobility and people to follow it.

The hopes which ecclesiastical superiors had conceived of the new Constantine¹ who had entered the Church, not from motives of State policy but from conviction, did not remain unfulfilled, although it is to be much regretted that the life of Clovis did not thoroughly correspond to his new profession, but was stained by many acts of cruelty.

St. Gregory of Tours also presents us with a very gloomy picture of the reigns of the sons and successors of Clovis. The Church was many times brought into conflict with brutality of manners and depravity of morals among them; but by degrees the influence of

¹ *Greg. Turon.* ii. 31. Procedit novus Constantinus ad lavaerum, etc.

religion prevailed, and prepared this mighty people¹ for the position preordained by God that they should hold among the nations.

The efforts of the Frankish bishops, who passed the most salutary decrees at their synods, were powerfully supported by Irish monks, who took an important part in the religious education of the Franks. Among these St. Columban holds a distinguished place. He founded a monastery at Luxeuil in Vosges, but was driven from it by Theodoric II., with whose licentious behavior he had found fault.

More favorable circumstances befriended the Church during the reign of Dagobert I. (+ 638), but it was St. Boniface who was called upon to complete the work of Christianizing and of regenerating the Franks.

§ 79. *Christianity in the British Isles.*²

It is certain that the Christian religion was known in Britain at a very early period; but the number of Christians in Ireland and Scotland before the fifth century was not great. Pope Celestine consecrated Palladius bishop (431), and sent him to Ireland; but he did not succeed in his mission. His place was soon taken by St. Patrick, the true apostle of Ireland, who to a thorough knowledge of the country united an extraordinary zeal, which eminently fitted him for the task of conversion. St. Patrick (Patricius) was born at Bonavem Taverniae (Boulogne), on the coast of Picardy, then called Armorica.³ At the age of sixteen he was taken captive and brought to Ireland, where he spent six years as a shepherd. After recovering his freedom by divine interposition, he came again to Gaul, and received his education in knowledge and virtue in the monasteries of Marmoutier and Léris. At the recommendation of St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre (+ 448), who was for a time his spiritual father, he visited Rome in the year 431. Here he received from Pope Celestine his commission to Ireland (Erim, Hibernia), to plant the Christian religion among a people whose spiritual

¹ Cf. Praef. in leg. Salicam: *Gens Francorum inelyta, autore Deo condita, fortis in armis, firma pacis foedere, profunda in consilio, corpore nobilis et incolumis, canore et forma egregia, audax, velox et aspera, nuper ad Catholicam fidem conversa, immunis ab haeresi, etc.*

² *Greith*, Hist. of the Old Irish Church, p. 95 sqq. John Lanigan's and Thomas Moore's Histories of Ireland.

³ Life of St. Patrick, by *Wm. B. Morris* and by *Miss Cusack*. Cardinal Moran claims that St. Patrick was born in Scotland.

welfare he held of higher account than the natural wishes of his parents and relatives that he should remain with them. Having been consecrated bishop by Amator, Bishop of Evreux (Ebroicum) in Gaul, he arrived with a few companions in Ireland in 432.

The inhabitants of the island were principally addicted to star-worship, and they venerated fountains. St. Patrick at first met with serious difficulties on the part of the bards and Druids; but his courage did not give way. With unremitting zeal he traversed the country, promoting the monastic life, for which he won over young men and maidens of the noblest families, and providing for the education of an able and efficient clergy. He took up his residence at Armagh, which became the metropolis of Ireland.

Though our saint had experienced many hardships in his missionary life, he never allowed himself the pleasure of revisiting his beloved native country. He reached a great age, and died in 465 (or, according to some, 495), in the monastery of Saul, which he had founded. At that time Ireland had already several bishops and numerous priests and monks. The cloisters St. Patrick had founded became asylums of science and seminaries of learning to bless and enlighten many nations who were at that time still in the darkness of paganism.

St. Patrick was succeeded in the See of Armagh by Benen, or Benignus. "Towards the close of the fifth century St. Bridget introduced into Ireland a rule for nuns, and founded many convents throughout the country, the most famous of which was that of Kildare¹ (490). There can be no better evidence of the energy, prudence, and zeal of St. Patrick and of those who took up his work after him, — no better test of the docility, earnestness, and generosity of the Irish people, — than the fact that in the course of the sixth century the gospel had spread from one end of the island to the other, from hamlet to city and from palace to cottage.

"Muchtbertach, the chief king, who reigned from 513 to 533, openly professed Christianity, and multitudes of men of all classes and of every age forsook the world to follow Christ. The face of the whole island was changed. A nation which but a few short years before had been shrouded in the darkness of paganism was suddenly illumined by the pure rays of divine truth. Erin became the island of saints, the home and refuge of learning and of holiness, and the nursery whence missionaries went forth to carry the light of faith to the nations of the European continent. Her children

¹ Kill-dara = cellae quereus. See *Montalembert's Monks of the West*.

preserved the faith of Christ as pure and entire as it came from the lips of her apostle ; heresy and schism were unknown to them, and loyalty to the successor of St. Peter was one of their most distinguished characteristics." (*Alzog.*)

Such are historical facts, in themselves so extraordinary and so well attested that it is impossible to deny them ; and so cheering are they to every Catholic historian that he must feel delighted in recording them.

From Ireland the Christian religion made its way into Scotland (Caledonia). The Caledonians, who (like the Irish) were either a Gallie or a Celtic tribe, then lived in the north of this country. The Picts, who had come from Scandinavia, lived in the south. These latter were converted to the faith in the year 412 by Bishop Ninian,¹ a native of Britain. The Caledonians received the gospel through the Irish monk St. Columban, who at the island of Iona or Hy (Hy-Columbkill) founded a monastery from which numerous missionaries went forth, who by degrees converted the people of the whole country. St. Columba² also baptized King Brid (or Brud) and his people. His successors became very powerful, and in honor of the memory of the saint, the abbots of Hy Monastery were allowed to exercise a kind of jurisdiction³ over the bishops of Scotland. The great missionary, who had been endowed with the gift of working miracles, died after a long, laborious, and successful life, in 597.

Whilst in Ireland and Scotland the Church was making such great conquests, the condition of Christianity in Christian Britain became deplorable ;⁴ more especially when after the withdrawal of

¹ *Beda Venerabilis*, H. E. iii. 4. *Australes Picti . . . fidem veritatis acceperant, praedicante eis verbum *Ninia* episc. rev. et sanctiss. viro de natione Britonum, qui erat Romae regulariter fidem et mysteria veritatis edoctus.*

² L. e. iii. 4. *Vita s. Columbani. Greifh. Montalembert.*

³ *Beda Venerabilis*, H. E. iii. 4. *Habere autem solet ipsa insula rectorem semper abbatem presbyterum, cuius juri et omnis provincia et ipsi etiam episcopi *ordine inusitato* debeant esse subjecti, juxta exemplum primi doctoris illius (scil. Columbae) qui non episcopus sed presbyter existit et monachus.*

⁴ *Gildas, Sap.* (+ 570) de excidio Brit., complains of the unbridled passions of the laity : *Reges habet Britannia sed tyrannos, judices habet sed impios, saepe praedantes et concutientes sed innocentes, etc.* Of the clergy he says : *Sacerdotes habet Britannia sed insipientes . . . pastores, ut dicuntur, sed occisioni animarum lupus paratos . . . populus docentes, sed praebendo pessima exempla . . . raro sacrificantes ac raro puro corde inter altaria stantes . . . religiosam forte matrem seu sorores domo pellentes, et externas velutini secretiori ministerio familiares indecenter levantes vel potius . . . humiliantes (ii. 1. iii. 1. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. lxix. col. 347, 367).*

the Romans the Britons were no longer able to defend themselves against the incursions of the Picts and Scots, but sought the alliance of the Saxons and Angles (449). These allies subdued the country to their own authority. Under their sway the ancient Britons were driven to the western parts of the island; many of them fled to Armorica in Gaul, afterwards called Bretagne. Wales and Cornwall remained as the principal seats of the ancient Celtic tribes. Here, as late as the beginning of the sixth century, we find flourishing monasteries, devoted princes, and eminent bishops; for example, St. David, Archbishop of Minevia (+ 544), St. Dubricius, St. Udoceus, St. Paternus, and others. But nothing was done by the ancient British clergy for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons;¹ on the contrary, it would rather seem they themselves became degenerate.

The Anglo-Saxons pertinaciously adhered to their own idolatrous worship. Their final conversion is principally owing to the invincible charity and solicitude of Gregory the Great.² Already as a monk, at Rome, he had taken the resolution to announce the gospel of Christ to those far distant people; but as he was not able to carry out his design himself, on his accession to the papal throne (590), he sent the holy abbot Augustine to Britain. Augustine with thirty-nine Roman monks landed at the isle of Thanet, in the kingdom of Kent (597). The king, Ethelbert, had married a Christian princess, Bertha, daughter of a Frankish monarch. It was here that Augustine began to preach the gospel.³ The king and the greater part of his subjects were converted.⁴ Kent became the centre of missionary labor. By command of the Pope, Augustine was consecrated Archbishop of the Anglo-Saxons by Vigilius, former abbot of Lérins and the Metropolitan of Arles. Augustine took up his residence at Canterbury (Dorovernum), which became the first ecclesiastical metropolis of the country. On Christmas (597) ten thousand Anglo-Saxons were received into the Church. Gregory acted with great prudence and moderation in regulating the ecclesiastical affairs

¹ *Beda Venerabilis*, H. E. i. 22. Nunquam genti Saxonum sive Anglorum, secum Britanniam incolenti, verbum fidei praedicando committerent (scl. Brit.).

² *Mabillon*, Act. sanctor. Ord. Bened. i. 378 sqq. *Beda Venerabilis*, H. E. i. 23 sqq. *Montalembert*, iii. 331 sqq.

³ *Lingard*, Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

⁴ In order to facilitate the conversion of the natives, Gregory commanded Augustine not to destroy the heathenish temples: sed ipsa, quae in eis sunt, idola destruantur, aqua benedicta fiat, in eisdem fanis aspergatur, altaria construantur, reliquiae, etc. (*Beda Venerabilis*, H. E. i. 31).

among the new converts. He also authorized Augustine to establish twelve episcopal sees in southern, and as many in northern Britain.

Saberet, King of Essex, a nephew of Ethelbert (the Bretwalda, or chief king, of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy), became a Christian. He was baptized by Mellitus, one of the new missionaries sent by Gregory. Mellitus became the first bishop of London. St. Augustine died in 604. It is to be regretted that his efforts to reform the Christian Britons were not successful.¹

In the year 616 Ethelbert and Saberet both died. This made the prospects of the Church far less encouraging. The sons of both the kings had remained pagans, and they led scandalous lives. After the death of Augustine the remaining missionaries in 605-607 no longer displayed their former firmness, and during the reigns of the heathenish kings of Kent and Essex Christianity met with severe difficulties.

Mellitus, Bishop of London,² was expelled from the kingdom. His companion Justus, who had become Bishop of Rochester, also had to cross over to France. Lawrence, Archbishop of Canterbury, was on the point of leaving, when, as if by miracle, the conversion of Eadbald, son and successor of Ethelbert, occurred. Justus and Mellitus were recalled, and Christianity again began to progress. When Lawrence died (619), Mellitus succeeded him in the See of Canterbury. He was himself succeeded by Justus in 624.

The marriage of Edwin, King of Northumbria, with Ethelburga, a daughter of Ethelbert, had revived the prospects of the Church, and subsequent events induced the king to embrace Christianity.³ He proposed a conference in 627 with his priests and thanes. Koifi, the high-priest, was the first to declare against idolatry, whereupon the king and the people also renounced it. Paulinus, one of the monks whom Pope Gregory had sent to aid Augustine, had already been consecrated Bishop of Northumbria. He now took his seat in York (Eboracum).

King Edwin also influenced Cerdic, King of East Anglia, to enter the Church. Unhappily, this virtuous prince was assassinated

¹ *Beda Venerabilis*, H. E. ii. 2. Augustine desired, ut Pascha suo tempore celebretis, ut ministerium baptizandi, quo Deo renascimur, juxta morem sanetae Romanae et apostolicae ecclesiae compleatis, ut genti Anglorum una nobiscum verbum Dei praedicetis. Cetera, quae agitis, quamvis moribus nostris contraria aequanimiter cuncta tolerabimus.

² The See of London remained thirty years (until 653) without a bishop.

³ *Beda*, ii. 9.

by a pagan three years after his conversion. But his brother Sigeburt, with the help of Felix, Bishop of Burgundy, continued the work of Christianizing the people (630).¹

The invasions of Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, and of Ceadwalla, the British king, into Northumbria and East Anglia, were very injurious to the Church. It was not till the reign of Oswald, a nephew of King Edwin, and himself a zealous Christian, that the prospects of religion were favorably renewed.

Aidan, an Irish monk from the monastery of Iona, was conspicuous for his zeal in converting this barbarous people. He was consecrated bishop, and took his seat on the island of Lindisfarne, where he founded a monastery. Numerous Irish monks came both from Ireland and Scotland to share his labors.²

Oswald (+ 642) also gave powerful support to the monk Birinus, whom Pope Honorius sent in the year 634 to preach Christianity in Wessex.³

Mercia became Christian under Peada, the son of Penda, who had become acquainted with Christianity at the court of King Oswy, the successor of Oswald. Diuma, from the monastery of Iona, became their first bishop. Peada was baptized in the year 653 by Finan, also a monk of Iona, and the first successor to St. Aidan. Penda fell in a battle against Oswy in 655.

Under King Sigeburt the inhabitants of Essex were brought back to the Church by the exertions of Cedd, an Anglo-Saxon monk of Lindisfarne, who was afterwards consecrated Bishop of the East Saxons. He took his seat at London.

In Sussex, the last kingdom of the heptarchy to embrace Christianity, the gospel was in 678 successfully preached by St. Wilfrid,⁴ Bishop of York. Edbert, abbot of the monastery of Selsea, became the first bishop in Sussex.

In the year 668 Pope Vitalian consecrated the learned Grecian monk Theodore of Tarsus Archbishop of Canterbury, which St. Augustine had made metropolitan see instead of London, and sent him in company with Abbot Adrian to England. These two founded

¹ L. c. ii. 15. *Sigeburtus, vir per omnia Christianissimus atque doctissimus, qui, vivente adhuc fratre, cum exularet in Gallia fidei sacramentis imbutus est, quorum partipem, mox ubi regnare coepit, totam suam provinciam facere curavit.*

² *Montalembert*, a. O. Bd. 4.

³ *Beda*, iii. 7.

⁴ Concerning Wilfrid, especially his contest with Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, who divided the Archdiocese of York into three bishoprics, see *Montalembert*.

schools of theology, mathematics, and the classics,¹ to which numerous learned men owed their training, among whom were the Abbot Albinus, and Bishop Tobias of York (+ 726).

Many Anglo-Saxons studied in the Irish monasteries, and thus between the churches of England and Ireland a close alliance was formed. Both rose to a flourishing condition. Archbishop Theodore (668-690) visited the various churches of England, held several synods,—one at Hereford in 673, the first in the Anglo-Saxon Church,—and was at great pains to regulate all ecclesiastical affairs.

The natural aversion which the ancient Britons bore to the Anglo-Saxon converts decreased as the spirit of Christianity became diffused throughout England; but there still existed differences between the ancient Britons and the missionaries concerning certain rites, as concerning the manner of administering the sacrament of baptism, the form of ecclesiastical tonsure, and especially concerning the computation of time for regulating the festival of Easter. Having been cut off from all intercourse with Christian society, the Britons had no acquaintance with the computation of the cycle by Denys the Little (*Exiguus*), and like the Irish continued to follow the Jewish or ancient Roman cycle of eighty-four years, as first introduced by the early missionaries.

In the south of Ireland the rule adopted by the Church was cheerfully received after the instructions of Pope Honorius had been asked for and given (633 or thereabouts). In the north, on the contrary, where the monks of Iona exercised a powerful influence, the ancient rule was as yet followed, and this out of fidelity to the venerable traditions.

In Northumbria, where three Irish kings reigned successively, Easter was by one of them celebrated according to the Irish, or rather the ancient, computation; by the two others, according to the time decreed by the Roman Church.

The dispute was brought before a Witenagemot, or parliament, at Strenaeshaleh (Whitby) in 664. King Oswy, his son Alchfrid, and the famous abbess Hilda were present. Oswy finally declared that

¹ *Beda Venerabilis*, H. E. iv. 2. *Quia literis sacris simul et saecularibus abundanter ambo (Theod. et Hadr.) erant instructi, congregata discipulorum caterva, scientiae salutaris quotidie flumina irrigandis eorum cordibus emanabant.* On this he adds that in these schools poetry, astronomy, and mathematics are taught, and then continues: *Indicio est quod usque hodie supersunt de eorum discipulis, qui Latinam, Graecamque linguam aequa ut propriam, in qua nati sunt, norunt.* Church singing was also taught. *L. c. Lingard, Antiquities.*

the rule observed at Rome should be followed in deference to the authority of the Apostle St. Peter. The assembly expressed their desire to follow this rule of Rome, as also the form of tonsure called "tonsurā Sancti Petri," and gave up that of shaving only the front of the head in the form of a semicircle ("tonsurā Simonis Magi").

Colman, Bishop of Lindisfarne, however, dissented from this, and preferred to resign his bishopric rather than sanction it. He adhered to the ancient rule introduced by St. Columba, and retired to the monastery of Iona.

Abbot Adamnan at last succeeded, in 703, in causing the uniform observance to be accepted in the north of Ireland. The Anglo-Saxon priest Egbert was successful in 716 in introducing this uniformity in the monastery on the island of Hy (Iona). It was also accepted by the inhabitants of Cambria, and thus it was soon everywhere established. But during this long controversy, in which resistance to change had been occasioned by attachment to the old traditions, the real connection with Rome had never been interrupted or even loosened, nor had the authority of the Apostolic See been disregarded; the resisting parties ever afforded eminent evidences of their attachment to Rome, and in matters of faith the churches of the British Isles had ever remained in full harmony with the teachings of the Roman Church.

§ 80. *Christianity in Germany.*

The first implanting of Christianity in Germany proper¹ had been in great measure disturbed by the migration of the nations, and new missionaries were required either to announce the gospel anew to the inhabitants or to confirm them in their faith.

The greater number of these evangelists were men of superior education, distinguished for sanctity, endowed with the gift of working miracles, and authorized for their mission by the sanction of the Apostolic See. They overcame the many obstacles that lay in the way of their work of conversion by the erection of monasteries. The first missionaries who brought the light of faith to Germany were either Irish or Scotch.

In the year 511 St. Fridolin,² an Irishman by birth, after having wandered through Gaul, came to the banks of the upper Rhine, and

¹ Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in *Potthast*, Bibliotheca medii aevi, i. 10 sqq. *Hansiz*, Germ. sacra. Aug. Vindel, 1727 sqq. 3 vols. fol.

² Vita Fridolin with Mona. Collection of Sources of the History of Baden, i. 1 sqq.

founded two cloisters at Säckingen which greatly contributed to diffuse the faith among the Alemanni in Alsatia, Switzerland, Brisgovia, and Würtemberg. It was a hundred years later that St. Columban,¹ who had been driven away from Gaul, appeared in Germany. He had made a short stay near Zurich, and then established himself at Bregenz on Lake Constance till the false accusations brought against him by Theodoric II. before Duke Gonzo, induced him to leave the country. He went to Italy, and founded the monastery of Bobbio in the Apennines (+ 615).

St. Gall, the disciple and companion of Columban, likewise an Irishman (+ 625 or 646), remained in Helvetia and founded the celebrated monastery of St. Gall.² His disciple Magnus founded the monastery of Füssen (Faucense); another disciple, Theodore, the Abbey Kempten (Campodunum). St. Trudpert labored in Brisgovia. Here he was murdered by his servant (+ 643).³

St. Pirminius⁴ labored at reviving the Christian faith in Alsatia, etc. He founded the monastery of Reichenau in 724; and when driven from thence in 727 he founded several other monasteries, among them that of Hornbach in the diocese of Metz (+ 753).

In Bavaria and Austria heresy and paganism had done great damage to the Church; but it was chiefly in Bavaria that the errors of Photinus⁵ and Bonosus⁶ had found adherents.

In the year 535 St. Rupert, Bishop of Worms, came to Bavaria, and soon succeeded in converting the Duke Theodo the Elder, with many of his nobles and people. Rupert then founded two monasteries in Salzburg (Juvavia), and, being supported by Frankish priests and nuns, he labored very successfully and with a great blessing for the conversion of this country.

No less successful were the efforts of St. Emmeran, Chorerepiscopus of Poitiers, who, when on his missionary journey he had arrived at Regensburg (Ratisbon), complied with the request of the duke of that place, Theodo (Dioto), and preached the gospel to the inhabitants (652) of Bavaria. Unhappily, he was murdered by Landpert, brother of Uda, the duke's daughter, who had falsely accused the saint of a crime. Landpert had already hated the saint for being

¹ Vita sceti Columbani: Auctore Iona abate Bobiensis in *Mabillon*, Acta scet. ord. s. Bened. ii. 5 sqq. Greith, Ancient Irish Church, p. 271. See § 78.

² Vita sceti Galli in *Pertz*, Mon. Germ. hist. ii. 1 sqq.

³ Vita sceti Trudberti with Mone.

⁴ Mone, a. a. O. p. 28 sqq.

⁵ See § 58.

⁶ See § 69.

too free-spoken, and was but too willing to undertake the cruel deed.

St. Corbinian,¹ a no less celebrated preacher of the faith in Bavaria (+730), founded the monastery of Freisingen (717). Among the Eastern Franks, whose capital was Würzburg, the seeds of the gospel were sown by the Irish missionary St. Killian² (Kyllena), who baptized Duke Gozbert. But he was insidiously assassinated at the instigation of Geilana, sister-in-law of the duke.

In the countries lying along the banks of the Rhine, where several Christian churches had arisen as early as in the third century, zealous missionaries and cloistered communities labored unremittingly for the further extension and strengthening of Christianity. Under Amandus II. (Bishop of Maastricht since 646), the Christian religion made great progress in Belgium. Audomar preached to the Morini; St. Livin, an Irishman and martyr, and St. Eligius, Bishop of Noyon, labored in Flanders (+658).

Wilfrid, Bishop of York (+709), and St. Wigbert undertook to spread the faith among the Frisians. Wulfram, Bishop of Sens (+695?), tarried a long time in Friesland without being able to convert the Prince Radbot. After the victory of Pepin of Héristant, near Dorstadt (689), which reduced the southern part of Friesland to subjection to the Frankish authority, St. Willibrord (+739) undertook the work of conversion. He was an Anglo-Saxon priest who had been educated in Ireland; he became the first bishop of Utrecht, and extended his field of labor to the district under Radbot's command.

In 698 Willibrord founded the monastery of Echternach as a central point of the mission. The conversion of all the Frisians was brought to a successful issue, when, after the death of Radbot (+719), Charles Martel had subdued the remaining portions of the Frisian territory.

§ 81. *Labors of St. Boniface.*

The most distinguished missionary among the apostolic laborers of Germany is the Anglo-Saxon monk Winfried,³ born at Kirton in Devonshire, in the year 680. He gave to the Church in Germany

¹ Vita seti Corbin. in acta setorum ed. Boll. 8 Sept. tom. iii. p. 281 sqq.

² Vita seti Kiliani in Op. Canisii, ed. Busnagi, iii. 174 sqq.

³ Ep. seti Bonif. ed. Serarius, 1605. Würdtwein. Mogunt. 1789: ed. Giles, Oxon. 1846.

a complete organization, and established most intimate relations between that church and the centre of Christendom, thus consolidating the unity and permanence of the various churches; moreover, he carried the light of the gospel among those German tribes who had not yet renounced idolatry.

Having been carefully educated in the celebrated monasteries of Exeter and Nutcell, Winfried began (716) to preach to the Frisians; he was, however, obliged to leave their country in the following year. The young priest then made a short stay in England, and in the year 718 set out for Rome. Pope Gregory II. authorized him to preach the gospel in Germany.¹ He began his new missionary labors in Thuringia, then for a time he labored successfully in assisting St. Willibrord in Friesland, but in the year 721 he returned to Thuringia and Hesse. Here he baptized many heathens, and founded the monastery of Amoeneburg.

In the year 722 Winfried went to Rome,² at the invitation of Gregory II., to whom he had sent a report of the progress of his mission. Here he was consecrated bishop for Germany ("episcopus regionarius") by Pope Gregory, who bestowed on him the name Bonifacius. Here, too, he took the oath of allegiance³ to the Roman Catholic Church, and received commendatory letters to

¹ Ep. Greg. II. ad Bonif. Ep. 12, ed. *Jaffé*. The citations following are also of this edition.

² *Jaffé*, Bibliothek rer. Germ. iii. 21.

³ Boniface took the same oath as that of the suburban bishops. It runs thus: Promitto ego Bonifacius gratia Dei Episcopus, vobis, beato Petro apostolorum principi, vicarioque tuo beato Papae Gregorio, successoribusque ejus, per Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, Trinitatem inseparabilem, et hoc saceratissimum corpus tuum, me omnem fidem et puritatem sanctae fidei catholicae exhibere, et in unitate ejusdem fidei, Deo operante, persistere, in qua omnis Christianorum salus esse sine dubio comprobatur, nullo modo me contra unitatem communis et universalis ecclesiae, suadente quopiam, consentire, sed, ut dixi, fidem et puritatem meam atque conursum tibi et utilitatibus tuae ecclesiae, cui a Domino Deo potestas ligandi solvendique data est, et praedicto vicario tuo atque successoribus ejus per omnia exhibere. Sed et si cognovero, Antistites contra instituta antiqua sanctorum patrum conversari, cum eis nullam habere communionem aut conjunctionem: sed magis si valuero prohibere, prohibeam; si minus, ne (nae) fideliter statim Domino meo Apostolico renuntiabo. Quodsi, quod absit, contra hujus promissionis meae seriem aliquid facere quolibet modo, seu ingenio, vel occasione, tentavero, reus inveniar in aeterno iudicio, ultionem Ananiae et Saphirae incurram, qui vobis etiam de rebus propriis fraudem facere vel falsum diceré praesumperunt. Hoc autem indiculum sacramenti ego Bonifacius exiguus Episcopus manu propria scripsi, atque positum supra saceratissimum corpus tuum ut superius leguntur Deo teste et judice, praestiti sacramentum. Quod et conservare promitto (*Jaffé*, l. c. p. 76).

Charles Martel¹ and the German clergy. Boniface then returned to the scene of his former labors.

Under the protection of Charles Martel,² aided and assisted by English priests and nuns,³ Boniface labored for the conversion of the pagans in Thuringia and Hesse, following meantime the wise instructions of Daniel, Bishop of Winchester.⁴ The fall of the thunder-oak⁵ of Geismar (724) foretold the approaching downfall of paganism in that region.

From Thuringia Boniface passed to the Franks, where he carried on the warfare against a degenerate Christianity and an ignorant and immoral clergy; these labors were productive of beneficial results.

Meantime Gregory II. had died (731). His successor, Gregory III., conferred the archiepiscopal pallium on Boniface, with full authority to erect new bishopries and consecrate bishops to fill them.

After an unsuccessful attempt to convert the Saxons, Boniface devoted his attention to the Church in Bavaria, and in the year 738 set out on his third journey to Rome. Here he spent a whole year, and then returned to Bavaria as Primate of Germany, which he divided into four dioceses, — Salzburg, Ratisbon, Freisingen, and Passau. Then he set to work to organize the Church in Franeonia, Hesse, and Thuringia, by erecting the bishopries of Würzburg, Buraburg, Eichstädt, and Erfurt.

To regenerate the clergy and people, the new primate held several synods (742-746), at which special precepts were passed to regulate the conduct of priests and nuns; the bishops were warned that it was their duty to keep watch over their sees; incest, selling Christian slaves to idolaters, and other vices were strictly forbidden,

Ep. 18-22, 26. The Pope asks of Charles Martel: *Ut eum (scil. Bonif.) in omnibus necessitatibus adjuvetis, et contra quoslibet adversarios, quibus in Domino praevaletis, instantissime defendatis.*

² Ep. 24.

³ Bonifacius petitions frequently for prayer and help. Ep. 29, 62, 76, 100.

⁴ He gives St. Boniface this advice: *Haec (scil. the absurdities of heathenism) et his similia multa alia, quae nunc enumerare longum est, non quasi insultando vel irritando eos, sed placide, ac magna objicere moderatione debes: et per intervalla, nostris, id est Christianis, hujusmodi comparandae sunt dogmatibus superstitiones, et quasi e latere tangendae, quatenus magis confuse quam exasperate Pagani erubescant, pro tam absurdis opinionibus, et ne nos latere eorum nefarios ritus ac fabulas aestimenter.*

⁵ Vita sceti Bonif. anct. Willibaldo, c. 6. This thunder-oak was a sanctuary of the gods, and supposed to be under their special protection, so that when it was cut down, and its fall not avenged by the gods, the superstition died out of itself.

together with many superstitious observances and unseemly practices which took their rise from heathenism. The two heretics, Adalbert and Clement, were excommunicated at one of these synods.¹

Boniface, who in all important matters consulted the Apostolic See, was especially anxious, by the founding of monasteries, to be able to educate missionaries, and to render it possible for the German clergy to receive a religious and solidly scientific training; and by the restoration of the metropolitan authority, which had loosened its hold, to revive the influence and strengthen the power of the German episcopate; also by concentration to reanimate their vitality, and impart unity to their measures, through their reognition of this chief pastor.

Boniface had intended to take up his episcopal residence at Cologne, but on the deposition of Gewilieb (745), he ascended the bishop's throne at Mentz. Pope Zachary then raised this see to metropolitan rank. After some years (753) Boniface, with the consent of Pope Stephen III., resigned the archiepiscopal see in favor of Lullus,² his disciple, and went once again to Friesland, to preach the gospel with zeal as ardent as when he had preached there in his youth. It was there that he and his companions received the crown of martyrdom, on the 5th June, 755. According to his own request, he was buried in the monastery of Fulda.

Unquestionably Germany in her political and religious relations owes more to St. Boniface than to any other of her distinguished men, for these latter built on the foundation which he had laid; therefore all those political, spiritual, or ecclesiastical developments that grew up afterwards, proceeded from the germ that he had planted.

His most noted disciples, after Lullus, were St. Gregory, Abbot of Utrecht, a descendant of St. Adela, Abbess near Treves, and St. Sturm, Abbot of Fulda, Willibald his biographer, his brother Wunibald, Bishop Burchard of Würzburg, and others.

Among the pious women who came under the spiritual influence of St. Boniface, we may mention St. Thecla, Abbess of Kitzingen, St. Lioba, Abbess of Bishopsheim, and St. Walburgis, Abbess of Heidenheim.³

¹ Cf. Ep. 50.

² He particularly enjoined him: *Tu, fili carissime, structuram in Thuringia a me coeptam ecclesiarum ad perfectionis terminum deduc: tu populum ab erroris invio instantissime revoca, tunc aedificationem basilicae jam inchoatae ad Fuldam comple, ibidemque meum multis annorum curriculis inveteratum corpus perduc.*

³ Cf. Vita seti Bonif. ex *Othlone ap. Jaffé*, l. c. p. 490.

§ 82. *Conversion of the Saxons and the Avari.*

The Saxons — a wild and cruel people (Eastphalians, Westphalians, and Angles), to whom the Christian missionaries Eligius of Noyon, the two Ewalds, Lebuin, and others had preached the gospel in vain¹ — accepted Christianity in the reign of Charlemagne.

Charlemagne, compelled thereto by their continual aggressions, undertook his first campaign (772) against the Saxons; he demolished the column of Irmin.² The vanquished had to deliver twelve hostages into the hands of the conqueror, and to promise that they would admit Christian missionaries. But this lenity was abused; in the year 774, when Charlemagne was at war with the Lombards, the Saxons, regardless of their promise, drove the missionaries out from among themselves, obliterated every trace of Christianity in their country, and made new irruptions into the kingdom of the Franks. A second time they were subdued and mildly treated by the conqueror. But the disaster Charlemagne met with in the Pyrenees inspired the Saxons with new courage, and though at Paderborn (777) they had feigned submission, they now, under the leadership of Wittekind, arose anew, drove out the missionaries, etc., and pressed forward, aided by the Frisians and the Danes, to the very banks of the Rhine. Charlemagne again defeated them; and when the vanquished again rebelled in 782, he, as a warning to the Saxons, in 783 caused forty-five hundred of the insurgents to be cut down.³ The whole nation arose once more, but succumbed in the diverse battles they fought (785). At length the Westphalian Wittekind and the Eastphalian Albion submitted, and received holy baptism. Only the Angle Bruno stood out against Charlemagne. A new war which began in 794 on account of the demand for tithes ended in the complete subjugation of the Saxon race, who were partly, at least, transferred to other localities. It was 805 before peace was placed on a secure foundation.

By this historical account it is manifest that the conduct of Charles

¹ See § 80. *Passio set. Ewaldorum, Beda*, H. E. v. 10; *Vita Lebuini* from *Pertz, Monumenta Germania hist.* tom. ii.

² The column of Irmin was the national sanctuary. Irmin was represented as bearing the weight of the universe.

³ L. c. ann. 782: *Et cum omnes Widokindum hujus sceleris anctorem proclamarent, emm tamen tradere nequirent, eo quod is re perpetrata ad Nordmannos se contulerat, caeterorum, qui persuasiōne ejus morem gerentes tantum facinus peregerunt, usque ad quattuor milia quingenti traditi, et super Alarum fluvium, in loco qui Ferdi vocatur, jussu regis omnes una die decollati sunt.*

towards the Saxons does not deserve the reprobation it has met with, especially as regards the manner in which he forced Christianity upon them; for it is to be observed that (1) A long experience had proved that a peaceful intercourse between the heathen Saxons and their Christian neighbors was absolutely impossible, since the first in spite of promises and treaties were ever making incursions into the kingdom of the Franks, plundering, destroying, murdering. (2) This rendered it necessary for Charlemagne to have recourse to arms and to subjugate the Saxons, as there was no other way left, either to restore peace to Europe or maintain it when restored. (3) On this account, also, the warfare, which on the side of the Saxons equally with that of the Franks took the guise of a religious strife, became necessarily of an exterminating character. (4) The means which Charlemagne first brought to bear upon heathenism consisted in demanding free access for the missionaries, free announcement of Christian doctrine, foundations for monasteries, and material support for the clergy. It was not until repeated insurrections had taken place and many acts of cruelty had occurred, that Charles resolved on measures of greater severity.¹

This severity, which is clearly referable to the circumstances in which the emperor was placed, was however disapproved of by the

¹ The chief articles of the capitulare, framed on this occasion (785), were : Si quis ecclesiam per violentiam intraverit, et in ea per vim vel furtum aliquid abstulerit, vel ipsam ecclesiam igne eremaverit, morte moriatur. (3) Si quis sanetum quadragesimale jejunium pro despectu Christianitatis contempserit, et carnem comedenter, morte moriatur. Sed tamen consideretur a Sacerdote, ne forte causa necessitatis hoc enilibet proveniat ut carnem comedat. (4) Si quis episcopum aut presbyterum sive diaconum interficerit, similiter capite plectetur. (5) Si quis a diabolo deceptus crediderit, secundum morem paganorum, virum aliquem aut feminam strigam esse, et homines comedere, et propter hoc ipsam incenderit, vel carnem ejus ad comedendum dederit, vel ipsam comedenter, capitis sententia punietur. (6) Si quis corpus defuncti hominis secundum ritum paganorum flamma consumi fecerit, et ossa ejus ad cinerem redierit, capite punietur. (7) Si quis deinceps in gente Saxonum inter eos latens non baptizatus se abseondere voluerit, et ad baptismum venire contempserit, paganusque permanere voluerit, morte moriatur. (8) Si quis hominem diabolo sacrificeaverit, et in hostiam more paganorum daemonibus obtulerit, morte m. (9) Si quis cum paganis consilium adversus Christianos inierit, vel cum illis in adversitate Christianorum perdurare voluerit, morte moriatur. Et quicunque hoc idem fraude contra Regem vel gentem Christianorum consenserit, morte m. (10) Si quis domino regi infidelis apparuerit, capitali sententia punietur. (11) Si quis filiam domini sui rapuerit morte m. (12) Si quis dominum suum vel dominam suam interficerit, simili modo punietur. (13) Si vero pro his mortalibus eriminibus latenter commissis aliquis sponte ad Sacerdotem confugerit, et confessione data agere poenitentiam voluerit, testimonio Sacerdotis de morte excusetur. (14), etc. *Perz, Mont. iii. leg. 1, 48.*

ecclesiastical authorities, among whom his friend Alcuin and Arno, Archbishop of Salzburg, were strenuous in advising milder measures and in deprecating conversions obtained by violence.¹ At length, when circumstances had in some measure shaped themselves into order, lenity² and indulgence replaced severity, and the seed sown by the zealous missionaries bore abundant fruit.³

To the most distinguished missionaries in Saxony belong the Saints Willehad, Bishop of Bremen; Ludgerus, Bishop of Münster (Mimigardeford); Wicho, Bishop of Osnabrück; Heribert, Bishop of Minden; Hadumar, Bishop of Paderborn; Suitbert, Bishop of Verden. Besides these bishoprics, Charlemagne founded Hildesheim and Halberstadt (at first Seligenstadt). Under Louis the Mild, the celebrated abbey New Corvey, on the Weser, was built.

The victory which Charles gained over the Avari, also called the Huns, opened the way to Christianity among these people, who had formed settlements in Pannonia. In 796 Tudun, one of their princes, with his followers, received holy baptism. St. Arno, Bishop of Salzburg, stood at the head of this mission.

§ 83. Christianity in the North of Europe.

St. Willibrord and St. Wilfrid of York, who were the first missionaries to the Danes,⁴ could not overcome the aversion of this people to the Christian religion. Ebbo, Bishop of Rheims, and the monk Halitgar, whom Louis the Mild had sent to Denmark to reconcile King Harold with his people, had better success.

What these had begun was continued by St. Ansgar,² a pious and

¹ Cf. *Hadr.* Pap. Ep. ad Carol. M. *Migne*, tom. xviii. col. 391. *Alcuin*, Ep. 37: *Attrahi poterit homo in fidem, non cogi.* *Cogi poteris in baptismum, sed non proficit fidei.* On the exaction of tithes, he says (Ep. 72): *Decimae, ut dicitur, Saxonum subverterunt fidem.* In Ep. 80 he writes to the emperor: *Componatur pax cum populo nefando (the Saxons) si fieri potest.* *Relinquantur aliquantulum minae, ne obdurati fugiant; sed in spe retineantur, donec salubri consilio ad pacem revocentur.* Cf. Ep. 31. *Idcirco misera Saxonum gens toties baptismi perdidit sacramentum, quia nunquam fidei fundamentum habuit in corde.*

² Cf. *Capit.* ann. 797. *Pertz*, l. c. p. 75.

³ How deeply Christianity was rooted in Saxony is proved by the popular poem *Helianus* (the Savior). See § 99.

⁴ Scriptores rerum Danicarum et Septentrionalium ap. *Pothast*, Bibliotheca mediæ aevi, i. 9 sqq.; ii. 5.

⁵ Vita Ansgarii by his pupil Rembert in *Pertz*, Mon. hist. (scriptor.) tom. ii. *Adam Bremens* (+ about 1076), *Gesta Hamburgensis eccl. pontificum.* Libr. 4 ap. *Pertz*, Mon. hist. (scriptor.) vii. 280 sqq. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxlii. 451 sqq.

learned monk of Corvey.¹ Already in his earliest youth he had been smitten with the desire of becoming a missionary. He with the monk Autbert came to Denmark in the company of King Harold, who had received holy baptism in Mentz in 826; yet, in consequence of the constant disturbances which distracted the country, he found his task a very difficult one.

In the year 832 the Archbishopric of Hamburg was founded to serve as a centre for the missions of the North. This, in 848, became united with that of Bremen. The first bishop of this see was Ansgar, who meantime had been preaching the gospel in Sweden. Pope Gregory IV. in giving him his assent had also nominated him Vicar Apostolic of the North. The Emperor Louis assigned the Abbey Turholt in Flanders to the new archbishop for his support. It was with the greatest difficulty² that Ansgar, whose episcopal city was destroyed by the Normans in 845, under the two kings Eric (Horic) I. and Eric II., could work at the conversion of the inhabitants of Sleswig and Jutland. Yet he succeeded in obtaining for the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and permission to build churches.³

After the death of Ansgar (865), who is rightly named the Boniface of the North,⁴ his disciple St. Rembert became Archbishop of Bremen-Hamburg. On account of the hostile disposition of Eric III. and of Gorm the Aged, towards Christianity, he was obliged to refrain from further attempts to spread Christianity, and to confine himself to the preservation of that which already existed.

It was not until after the victory gained by the German King Henry I. over the heathenish Danes, who had done so much mischief to the Church in their own land, as well as in the north of Ger-

¹ There were two cloisters of this name, Old Corvey (Corbie) in Picardy, and its affiliation, New Corvey in Saxony. To the latter Ansgar belonged. When designated for the missions in Denmark, he was in Old Corvey.

² Harold fell back into paganism. Charles the Bald took the revenues of the Abbey of Turholt into his own possession.

³ King Eric valued him so highly, "ut etiam inter secreta sua, dum de negotiis regni cum consiliais suis tractaret, ipsi (scil. Ansg.) liceret interesse" (Vita Ansg. c. 24). According to *Adam Bremens*, i. 27, Eric became a Christian (Pertz, vii. p. 295).

⁴ He lived by the work of his hands. As archbishop, he maintained the rule of his order; and when, after the destruction of Hamburg and the loss of the Abbey of Turholt, many deserted him, "ipse cum paucis, qui cum eo subsisterant, prout poterat, se agebat et licet in paupertate degens, injunctum sibi officium nequaquam deserere voluit" (Vita Ansg. c. 21).

many,¹ that hopes of a better future began to be entertained. It was then that Gorm had to promise toleration to the Christians.

The Archbishop Unni (or Hunni) then undertook a missionary journey to Denmark, where indeed he could effect no change in Gorm the Aged, but had more success with his son Harold Blaatand (Blue Tooth), who after the victory that the Emperor Otho I. had gained over him in 965, received baptism, and did his best to diffuse Christianity more and more in his own country.² But his religious zeal excited opposition among his own subjects. Harold was murdered in 986. His son Sweyn (Svend) destroyed what his father had built up; yet towards the end of his life he laid aside his enmity towards the Church.³ Canute I. (Knud I., + 1035) erected the first monasteries, and supported the missionaries to the best of his power. Canute II. (Knud II.) the Saint was a real ornament to the Danish Church. He died as a martyr in 1086.⁴

In 1104 Pope Urban II. raised the bishop's church of Lund to the dignity of a metropolitan see, to which the sees of Sweden and Denmark were made suffragans (were subordinated).⁵

The knowledge of Christianity was also brought to Sweden⁶ by St. Ansgar. After his return (831) to Denmark, a relative of his, Gauzbert, labored in Sweden until a revolt compelled him to leave the country.

Ansgar had better success when he came to Sweden a second time in 853. The people's assembly then allowed the gospel to be preached. The saintly archbishop soon returned to Denmark, leaving to his nephew Erimbert the mission in Sweden. The Archbishop Unni from Hamburg labored there for a short space after 935.

It was a long time, however, before the Christian religion prevailed over the power of paganism. Under King Olav Skotkonung (+ 1024) the bishopric Skara was founded. But the Temple of Upsal retained afterwards, as before, its celebrity. It was in vain that the bishops endeavored to persuade King Stenkil to demolish the national sanctuary.

It was his son Inge who first began in earnest to suppress pagan-

¹ *Luitprand*, *Antapodosis*. *Pertz*, tom. iii. p. 314.

² It was at this time that the first three bishoprics, Sleswig, Ripen, and Aarhus, were founded in Denmark.

³ In his reign Danish coins with the cross appeared (*Tapchorn*, p. 206).

⁴ A. a. O. S. 221 sqq.

⁵ A. a. O. S. 218-249. At a later date Sweden obtained a metropolis of her own.

⁶ *Scriptores rerum Suecicarum ap. Pothast*, l. c. i. 22.

ism. King Swerker erected the first monastery, and invited the Benedictines into the country; while his son and successor Eric IX. (+ 1160) completed the building of the metropolitan church at Upsal.

The inhabitants of Norway, who on their marauding excursions had often created disturbances and disquieted Christian lands, were commanded by King Hakon the Good, who had been baptized in England, to renounce idolatry. The resistance of his subjects compelled the king, however, to intermingle heathenish customs with Christian observances. King Harold of Denmark, who conquered Norway in 960, also made an effort to Christianize the inhabitants. But the people hated the conqueror; and Hakon Yarl, who drove the Danes away, obliterated every trace of Christianity. Neither were the exertions of King Olaf Trygvesen (995-1000), whom the Saxon priest Thankbrand accompanied to Norway, of much effect. After his overthrow still less was done for the Christian religion. King Olaf the Saint had better success (+ 1030). Norway became gradually converted to Christianity, and Drontheim (Nidoros) became its metropolis.

In Iceland the gospel had been already preached by a Saxon priest Frederic; later, by Thankbrand and the Icelander Stefnir. Finally (1000), at an assembly of the people it was resolved that Christianity should be introduced; and this, at the instigation of Lagmann Thorgeir,¹ a pagan priest, though much still remained to be done to effect a perfect conversion, for it was but by degrees that heathenish practices were done away. The first bishop of the island, Isleif, was consecrated by Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen (1056), and took up his residence at Skalholt.

During the reign of the Norwegian King, Olaf Trygvesen, Christianity was preached also to the inhabitants of Greenland (Bishopric Gardar) by the Icelander Leif.

§ 84. Christianity among the Slavonic Nations.—Conversion of the Magyars.

The Croatians entered the Church with their prince, Porgo, in 680, and were followed in course of time by all the tribes dependent on

¹ The articles were: (1) The Icelanders should receive baptism; (2) The idols and temples should be destroyed; and (3) Public sacrifices should be forbidden. On the other hand, private sacrifices, exposure of children, and eating horse-flesh were permitted.

the French kingdom, the Karantani (Styria, Carinthia, and Carnia), to whom the archbishops Virgilius and Arno (+ 820) of Salzburg had sent missionaries; in 868 Christianity was predominant even in Serbia.

Priests from Salzburg labored in Moravia; but here the great obstacles were the aversion of the people to the Germans, and their ignorance of the Slavic language. The Grecian monks, Sts. Cyril (Constantine) and Methodius,¹ had better success. Pope Adrian II. consecrated Methodius in Rome, and nominated him Bishop of Moravia and of Pannonia. Disorders in Moravia led him to withdraw to Pannonia. Here he met with some priests from Salzburg, who cast suspicion on his orthodoxy before the Apostolic See, and complained that he introduced Slavonie (glagolitic) language into the liturgy. Methodius therefore betook himself to Rome a second time, and convinced Pope John VIII. of his orthodoxy.

The Pope approved of the Slavonic liturgy, bestowed plenipotentiary powers on Methodius over all the clergy of Moravia, and sent him back thither. He here fell into disagreement with Duke Swatopluk, and was also at variance with the clergy. Methodius again appealed to the Pope, who cited him and his opponent Wiching, Bishop of Nitra, to appear at Rome (881). Subsequently the duke altered his mode of proceeding, and Methodius pursued his labors uninterruptedly up to the time of his death (885). At the desire of the Duke Moymir, Pope John IX. divided Moravia into an archbishopric and three bishoprics, to which the archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg raised objections. In the year 908 the great Moravian kingdom fell to pieces. One part of this, the present Moravia, retained possession of the See of Olmutz.

The inhabitants of Bohemia² obtained their first missionaries from Germany; but it was not before the end of the ninth century that Christianity was placed on any firm footing in this kingdom. Duke Borziwoi and his wife Ludmilla first became acquainted with the Christian faith at the court of the Moravian Duke Swatopluk (Zwentibold), and interested themselves in an extraordinary manner in diffusing the knowledge of it in Bohemia. Duke Wratislaw (+ 926) followed the example of his parents. His son Wenceslaw was murdered, as was also his grandmother, St. Ludmilla; and then

¹ Cyril died in Rome. Cf. *De Rossi*, *Bulletino* i. 8; ii. 1 sqq.

² Cosm. Prag. (+ 1125) *Chron. Bohem.* ap. *Pertz*, *Monumentum*, tom. ii. *Dobner*, *Monum. hist. Bohem.* Prag. 1764. *Gindely*, *Monum. hist. Bohem.* Prag. 1867. See *Potthast*, l. c. i. 6; ii. 4.

his heathenish brother, Boleslaw, succeeded to the throne. He, at the instigation of his mother, Drahomira, caused many Christians to be put to death. The victory of the Emperor Otho I. (950) compelled him, however, to refrain from the persecution of the Christians after that time.

Boleslaw II. the Pious¹ founded the Bishopric of Prague² in 973. After his death there were but few heathens remaining in Bohemia,—that is, nominally; for many heathenish practices still prevailed, such as polygamy, the sale of men, magical observances, and the like. When St. Adalbert (Woyciech), Bishop of Prague, sought to put an end to such scandals, he was driven from the country. He betook himself to heathenish Prussia, where he, in 997, underwent a martyr's death. On receiving the news of this, the Bohemians forsook their heathenish immoralities.³

From Bohemia, Christianity was carried to Poland.⁴ Duke Mieczyslaw, husband of the Bohemian Princess Dombrowka, received baptism in the year 965. His example was followed by the greater portion of the people. His son, Boleslaw Chrobry (the Powerful, 992–1025), founded the Archbishopric Gnesen (1000), and invited monks into the country.⁵ After his death anarchy ensued.

King Casimir (monk of Clugny?), who re-established order in Poland in 1036, was a zealous promoter of Christianity. On the other hand, Boleslaw II. did not inherit the pious disposition of his forefathers. The murder of St. Stanislans, Bishop of Cracow, by his order, occasioned the excommunication of the king, and obliged him to flee the country (+ 1081).

The Slavonic tribes who inhabited the northeastern part of Germany placed many obstacles in the way of conversion. The subjugation, by the German kings, of these tribes, who made common

¹ Of him *Cosmas*, Chron. Bohem. i. 22 (*Pertz*, xi. 48): *Erat vir Christianissimus, fide Catholicus, pater orphanorum, defensor viduarum, gementium consolator, clericorum et peregrinorum pius susceptor, ecclesiarum Dei praecipuus fundator.*

² Pope John XIII. confirmed it, but desired: *Verumtamen non secundum ritus aut sectas Bulgariae gentis, vel Russiae, aut Slavonicæ linguae, sed, magis sequens instituta et decreta apostolica, unum potiorem totius ecclesiae ad placitum eligas in hoc opus clericum, Latinis apprime literis eruditum.* *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxxxv. col. 997.

³ *Vita sceti Adalberti Ep. ap. Pertz*, Mon. vi. 581 sqq.

⁴ *Chron. Polon. ap. Pertz*, Mon. xi. 425 sqq.

⁵ In the cathedral of Gnesen the relics of St. Adalbert, Archbishop of Prague, so highly venerated in Poland, are deposited. To him is ascribed the celebrated hymn to Mary, “*Boga rodzieza.*”

cause with the Hungarians, who were also hostile to the empire, effected nothing in the way of converting them to Christianity. Even the efforts of their own rulers proved fruitless. The heathens murdered the zealous Prince of the Obotrites, Gottschalk, together with the Christian priests (1066), destroyed every remnant of Christianity, and even desecrated the graves of the bishops. The immigration of Christian colonists gave the first impetus to the development of the Church in these regions. One of the chief apostles to the Slaves was St. Benno (+ 1106), Bishop of Meissen. The thorough conversion of this people did not take place till the following centuries.

The Slavonic tribes which we have hitherto had under consideration were either converted by Latin missionaries, or at least had for the most part accepted the Latin rite. It fared otherwise with those of the Slavonic tribes¹ who joined the Church at Constantinople; they were thence drawn into the Greek schism.

Under the Empress Irene (797–802) and Basilius Maeedo (867–886), those of the Slavonic tribes who had settled in what is now modern Greece entered the Church together with the old heathenish Mainotti of the Peloponnesus. The central point of their ecclesiastical life were the monasteries on Mount Athos. These were under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The Bulgarians,² a Slavonic tribe, which in 680 had settled in Bulgaria and Thrace, became acquainted with Christianity on the predatory expeditions which they undertook under the leadership of their prince, Bogoris (Michael), in 864. At first Greek missionaries labored among them; but Bogoris fell out with Byzantium, and applied to Louis the German to send missionaries to him. He also sent an embassy to Pope Nicholas I. with many questions for solution. The Pope's written reply³ contains an excellent introduction, fitted to produce a social reformation among the Bulgarians. The Pope's legates met with a very favorable reception from Bogoris, and the mission was a successful one. And yet, as the Pope could not fulfil all the demands of the Bulgarian prince,⁴ this latter

¹ See also §§ 205 and 236.

² *Hergenröther*, Photins, i. 594; ii. 149.

³ *Responsa ad consult. Bulgarorum ap. Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxix. col. 978 sqq. Photius of Constantinople also sent a long letter to Bogoris. *Migne*, Patr. graec. tom. cii. col. 627 sqq.

⁴ This prince had been offended already by the refusal of Nicholas I. to confirm Formosus of Porto (afterwards Pope) in the archbishopric to which he had destined him. Formosus was laboring in Bulgaria.

attached his district to the See of Constantinople, and thus the Bulgarian Church became implicated in the Eastern schism.

In our time the Bulgarians are seeking to withdraw themselves from the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The Greek monk Methodius, the apostle of Moravia, preached the gospel to the Chazari in the Crimea after or about the year 850. In the year 1016 the country was incorporated into the Russian Empire.

The first missionaries to Russia were sent from Constantinople. In the year 955 the Russian Princess Olga (Helena) received baptism in Constantinople. Her son Swatoslav remained a heathen, but her grandson Wladimir in 988 entered the Church. The people then received Christianity without making any very considerable opposition. The first bishopries were those of Kiew and Novogorod; later on, the Russian Church was drawn into the Greek schism.

The Greek monk Hierotheus, who had accompanied Prince Gylas back to his country in Pannonia, after he had been baptized in Constantinople, labored hard but with little result among his countrymen, the wild Magyars or Hungarians¹ of Pannonia. But the German missionaries who came to Hungary after the victory obtained by Henry I. and Otho I. over these predatory hordes were more successful.

Among these missionaries were Piligrim, Bishop of Passau, St. Wolfgang of Ratisbon, and St. Adalbert of Prague. Duke Geisa (973), husband of Sarolta, the daughter of Gylas, favored Christianity without altogether renouncing heathenish worship. Under his son, St. Stephen, who was married to Gisela, sister of Henry II., Christianity made greater progress; for this "apostolic king"² who diffused the faith in Transylvania and in Wallachia was most earnest in his endeavors to make his subjects Christians, and to that end established eleven bishopries (Archbishopric of Gran) and erected several monasteries. Under Peter, his successor, a revolt of the heathen took place. The rebels drove the king from his throne, murdered bishops and priests, and suppressed Christianity.

After the revolt had been put down, victory decided for Christianity in Hungary. King Ladislans the Saint (1077-1095) destroyed the last vestige of heathenism.

¹ *Endlicher*, *Rerum Hungaricarum Mon. Arpadiana*. Sang. 1848. Pars i. Scriptores; pars ii. Leges. *Theiner*, *Monum. Hung. sacrum illustrantia*, tom. ii. 1859.

² Pope Sylvester II. is said to have granted him the royal title and sundry privileges. *Ep. to King Steph.* ap. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxxxix. col. 274.

§ 85. *Mahometanism.*

It was a powerful enemy to Christianity that arose in Islamism. The founder of it, Mahomet, was born in 569, of the tribe of the Koreitehites. He united several scattered Arabian tribes, extirpated idolatry from among them, and substituted his own doctrine in its place.

At first Mahomet seems to have been a visionary, but in after times he comes forth as an intentional impostor, giving himself out as a prophet of God. Yet he met with the most violent opposition from his own tribe, to escape from whose hostilities he in the year 622 had to flee from Mecca (Hegira), and take refuge in Yatreb (Medina al Nabi, July 15).

During his residence in this city the prophet, who was surrounded by a troop of faithful followers, matured his plan. He now came forth as prophet of the world, and determined, after he had first subjugated Arabia to his authority and his doctrine, to set forth on a career of conquest.

That which he had begun, his successors the caliphs continued. Syria in 639, Egypt in 640, Persia in 651, North Africa in 707, fell under their yoke; even Europe was threatened, and a great part of Spain from the eighth to the fifteenth century was compelled to bend beneath their power, which they also established in Sicily.

The doctrine of the prophet is a singular mixture of truth and falsehood. He firmly upholds Monotheism, asserts the creation of the world from nothing, and affirms the existence of good and bad spirits, of the last judgment, and of the resurrection; but he rejects the doctrine of the Trinity and of the providence of God, substituting for this latter the fatum, or destiny. He denies the incarnation and the redemption, justification and grace, and makes the blessedness of heaven and the punishments of hell consist altogether in sensual gratifications or the reverse.

The ethical precepts of Mahomet have no reference whatever to the interior sanctification of man; they extend only to his exterior actions. They prescribe prayer, fasting, alms-giving, pilgrimages to Mecca, warfare with unbelievers; and they forbid the murder of a fellow-believer, usury, etc.; while they permit polygamy, revenge by shedding blood, and other crimes. Worship, special religious teachers, and priests are unknown to the Koran; the appointment of Imans is of later date. The principal feasts of the Mahometans

are the two Beirams in commemoration of the sacrifice of Abraham and the end of the fast in the month of Ramadan.

Friday is the day appointed for the weekly religious services, instead of the Christian Sunday; it remained, however, a day of work. The sacred book of the Mahometans is the Koran,¹ which consists of one hundred and fourteen suras (chapters), arranged without order, and which often contradict one another.²

Many of the doctrines and precepts of the Koran are borrowed from Holy Scripture, from the Talmud and from Rabbinical writings. Mahomet designated Adam, Noe, Abraham, Ismael, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and Christ as his predecessors in the prophetic office. The Koran speaks of Christ with the greatest reverence, as also of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Mahomet declined the challenge to prove the truth of his divine mission by miracles, but referred to some passages of Holy Writ in attestation of it.³

At first the prophet, whose doctrines are in direct opposition to those of Christianity, advocated tolerance towards the religious belief of other men; after the Hegira, however, his tone changed, and he denied to unbelievers not only "eternal happiness," but the right of existence itself.

Christian writers⁴ have exposed the absurdities of Islamism, and have refuted the objections of the Moslems; but they have not been able to convert the Mahometans, or even to induce them to tolerate the Christian religion.

What problem Mahometanism is to solve, it is hard to determine. That it is a preparatory school for the ultimate reception of Christianity by its adherents is very doubtful, for Mahometans have hitherto shown but little predilection for the Christian religion.⁵

¹ This was put together after the death of the prophet, at the instigation of the Caliph Abu Bekr.

² The explanations occasioned a split among the learned Mahometans, into Sunnites (or Sunna = tradition) and Schiites.

³ Cf. Surah 7.

⁴ *John Damasc.* *De haeres.* *Migne*, Patr. graec. tom. xciv. col. 763 sq., 1585 sqq. *Theod. Abucaura*, *Carum episc. cont. haer. Judaeos et Saracen.* ap. *Migne*, Patr. graec. tom. xvii. col. 1461 sqq. Polemies against Islamism properly fall in the following period.

⁵ Cf. *Döllinger*, *Mahometan Religion and its Developments, with their Influence on the Lives of Nations.* Munich, 1838.

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

§ 86. *Establishment of the States of the Church.*

THE relation which the Church bore to the Germanic nations was at the beginning much the same as that which she had held to the heathen Roman Empire ; the rulers of the new kingdoms being either heathens or Arians, and as such being both of them persecutors of the Catholics. But when these people and their princes had embraced the Catholic faith, they began to be zealous in protecting the Church from the attacks of outsiders, and in providing for the support of her missionaries.

The relation which existed between the Church, together with the chief pastor of the Church, and the Franks was peculiarly close ; even during the sway of the Merovingians, the Pope applied to them for assistance, either in seeking protection against an enemy or in carrying out the laws of the Church.

Still more friendly became the intercourse between Church and State under the rule of the mayors of the palace Charles Martel and Pepin ; especially after the latter, having been crowned king by St. Boniface¹ in 752, felt himself under the obligation of protecting that Church under whose authority he had received the crown.

This new protective alliance might indeed become dangerous to the Pope ; but the threatened danger was more or less averted when the Pope became ruler of the States of the Church, and thereby obtained a free position.

Before the time of Constantine the Great, the Roman Church was

¹ Concerning the time of the coronation of Pepin, see *Hahn's Year-Book of the Frankish Empire*, p. 230 sqq. Leo says : "The Carlovingian kings, by the very manner in which they ascended the throne, acknowledged themselves sons of the Church, even in regard to their royal authority ; they sought in the Church the sanction for their reign, recognizing in its authority a higher power than their own, — one extending over the morals, to which ecclesiastical code of Christian morals even kings were subordinated. The principle that God is to be obeyed rather than man was established by their ascension to the throne, since they assumed it as their fundamental motive power ; and this ascension to the throne had been rendered possible by the fact that paganism had been almost unmoved, extinguished, in the eastern part of the kingdom by St. Bonifacius, and a new ecclesiastical power created, — a power the whole moral weight of which must fall against the kings if in the future time they should venture to violate the laws of God and of his Church in too striking a manner" (Lecture on German History, i. 481).

already in possession of property, and already the Popes, as well as the other bishops, exercised a certain jurisdiction over the Christians.¹ After the conversion of the emperor, however, who transferred his residence to Byzantium (Constantinople), the Church came into possession of large property and of extensive rule, both in the East and West, by the donations and bequests that were made to her. This was especially the case in upper and lower Italy, in the south of France, etc. In this way the Popes, as also the other bishops, obtained considerable political rights.

After the downfall of the Western Roman Empire the political influence of the Popes in Italy became of still more importance from the fact that the Popes had to take under their protection the unfortunate country, but particularly Rome and its environs, which were so often changing masters,² and continually exposed to the invasions of coarse and brutal conquerors.

While the successors of St. Peter were thus so energetically interesting themselves in the welfare of the inhabitants of Italy, these latter were totally neglected by the Eastern Roman Emperors, who still laid claim to rule the land. Even after Justinian I. had reconquered a part of Italy and converted it into a Grecian province, the lot of the inhabitants became no better; for the Byzantine Emperors could only exhaust by taxation the subjects of the Exarchate of Ravenna, but in no way could they afford her the necessary protection.³

Under these circumstances it necessarily happened that the despotic and in part illegitimate emperors of Byzantium lost all actual power, and remained only in name masters of the government, while the Popes, in virtue of the needs of the moment, came practically in possession of that supremacy over the Roman domain which they had assumed at the call of necessity. This spontaneous result of generous exertion was in after times acknowledged as a lawful acquisition.

The Popes, being compelled, by the continual predatory incursions of the Lombard princes into the Roman territory, to apply for help, at first had recourse to the Greek Emperors; but as these refused to listen, they next presented the same petition to the Frankish Mayor of the Palace.

It was with this view that Gregory III. had already written to

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 1 sqq.

² See §§ 74, 77.

³ Particularly during the iconoclastic struggle. See § 100.

Charles Martel,¹ who, however, provided no persistent help. Pope Zachary (+ 752) succeeded in keeping the Lombard King, Luitprand, from further incursions into the Roman territory by a series of treaties. But King Aistulf again threatened him, and was the more to be dreaded as this king had already subjugated the Pentapolis and the Exarchate of Ravenna.

Pope Stephen II. (III.), whose legates Aistulf had dismissed with contempt, first had recourse to the Byzantine court,² and then to Pepin,³ for aid and protection. He crossed the Alps with this intent, and, having made a fruitless attempt to obtain reasonable terms from Aistulf, he presented himself at the court of Pepin, on whom he bestowed the dignity and title of a "Roman patrician,"⁴ and whom he induced (September, 754) to march against Aistulf.

The latter promised to surrender the provinces he had occupied; but as he did not perform his promise,⁵ Pepin crossed the Alps a second time, and completely overthrew Aistulf. He then donated (or, as the contemporary writers express it, restored) the conquered territory to the Apostolic See. This donation (or restitution) of Pepin was confirmed and enlarged by his son Charlemagne, who in the year 774 put an end to the Lombard rule in Italy.⁶

In this legitimate way the temporal power and sovereignty of the Popes was, by the disposition of Divine Providence, gradually established. History has irrefragably demonstrated that such a temporal independence of the Pope was of paramount importance to the free-

¹ The Pope describes the desolation around Rome, and continues: *Conjuro te in Dominum vivum et verum et ipsas sacratissimas claves Confessionis b. Petri quas vobis ad regnum (ad regum?) dimisimus, ut non proponas amicitiam regum Longobardorum amori principis apostolorum* (*Migne*, I. c. tom. xcvi. col. 66).

² *Anast.* *Hist. de vitis Pontif.* ap. *Migne*, tom. cxxviii. col. 1087. The Pope begs the emperor, Constantine Copronymus, "ut juxta quod ei saepius scripsisset cum exercitu ad tuendas has Italiae partes modis omnibus adveniret et de iniquitatis filii moribus Romanorum hanc urbem vel cunctam Italiam provinciam liberaret."

³ *Migne*, I. c. tom. xcvi. col. 100 sqq.

⁴ *Annal.* Mettens. ann. 754. *Pertz*, *Mon.* i. 332. Stephanus papa . . . ordinavit secundum morem majorum unetione sacra Pippinum, piissimum principem, Francis in regem et patricium Romanorum.

⁵ Ep. *Steph.* ad Pipp. ap. *Migne*, I. c. col. 111 sqq.

⁶ Ep. *Steph.* ad Pipp. ap. *Migne*, I. c. col. 105: *Propria vestra voluntate per donationis paginam beato Petro, sanctaeque Dei ecclesiae, et reipublicae civitates et loca restituenda confirmasti. Cf. Annal. Mettens. ann. 755; Annal. Ful. ann. 754; Pertz, I. c. i. 347: Pippinus . . . Haistulphum . . . obsides dare et res sancti Petri reddere sacramento constringit.* *Thesiner*, *Codex diplomaticus dominii temporalis sectae sedis.* Rom. 1861, i. 1.

dom of the Pope and of the papal elections; also for the free exercise of the various functions required by the universal authority of the Popes, which extends over the whole of Christendom.

The great significance involved in the fact of Constantine the Great's transferring the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople is seen in the so-called Donation Act of Constantine (Donatio Constantini). According to this document the emperor conferred on the Pope, besides several honorable distinctions (tiara, lorum, imperial vestments, etc.), and other powers in full, the temporal dominion over Rome and the provinces, the cities and citadels in the whole of Italy or of the western regions.

This document, although opinions differ as to the place, time, and purpose of its origin, seems to have been drawn up in France in the ninth century. The assertion that it was forged or fabricated in favor of the papal dominion is refuted by the very fact that up to the twelfth century the Popes made no appeal to this document in favor of their temporal power, and since then have very seldom appealed to it. It was, moreover, hardly known in Rome up to 1053, and its authority received its increase only in the twelfth century. That it is spurious is no longer contested.

§ 87. *The Apostolic See and Charlemagne. — The Roman Empire of the West.*

Charlemagne, who was specially intent on continuing the work that had been begun by St. Boniface, sought to strengthen the bands of religious unity which had been formed among the Germanic tribes, to knit them closer and closer together; and for this purpose he endeavored to carry out the wise laws and regulations of the Apostle of Germany as far as it was possible, and set a good example himself by his faithful submission to the Apostolic See.¹

The successors of St. Peter were at that time only too much in need of a powerful protector; for they were oppressed by enemies from within and from without, and more than once had been compelled to leave their episcopal residence. In 799 Pope Leo III. (795-816), having been attacked and seriously ill-treated by a hostile party, sought this protection at the hands of Charlemagne,² and for this purpose went to him at Paderborn. Charlemagne complied with his

¹ Charles calls himself in the Praef. capit. : *Devotus sanctae ecclesiae Dei defensor atque adjutor in omnibus Apostolicae sedis.* *Pertz, Mon. tom. iii. (leg. 1) 33.*

² *Einh. Annal. ann. 799.*

request, suppressed the insurrection, and came himself to Rome in order fully to restore tranquillity. The criminals who were not able to substantiate their accusations against the Pope were beheaded. Leo, however, on whom the bishops did not venture¹ to pass judgment, voluntarily took the oath of purgation.

This conduct of Charlemagne found its justification in the office he held as Patrician of Rome. Now a new dignity was to adorn him; on Christmas day, in the year 800, Charles received from the hands of the Pope the crown imperial.² It was the restoration of the Western Empire. By this solemn and august ceremony,³ which in no way did injury to the rights of any other prince,⁴ nor, in fact, by any means increased the territorial possessions of the monarch thus newly crowned, the Pope and the emperor, the highest spiritual and the highest temporal power, entered into very intimate relationships one with the other.

The newly restored Western Empire had alike a political and a religious significance. The Christian princes of the West recognized a superior in the Roman Emperor, and the Catholic Church acknowledged in him her born protector, whose office it was to promote the diffusion of Christianity and to sustain ecclesiastical superiors in their action. In this way the Western Empire was to realize the sublime ideal of the kingdom of God, uniting within itself all the nations of the earth, without in any degree interfering with the independence of each one, or trammelling it in its development.⁵

¹ *Anast. Hist. de vit. Pontif. (Migne, l. c. tom. cxxviii. col. 1217).*

² *Anast. l. c. Annal. Moisiac. ann. 801 (Pertz, l. c. i. 305). Einh. Annal. ann. 801 : Ipse (sel. Carol.) autem cum die sacratissima natalis Domini ad missarum solemnia celebranda basilicam beati Petri apostoli fnisset ingressus, et coram altari, ubi ad orationem se inclinaverat, adsisteret, Leo papa coronam capiti ejus imposuit, cuncto Romanorum populo adelanante : Carolo Augnsto, a Deo coronato magno et pacifico imperatori Romanorum, vita et victoria ! Post quas laudes ab eodem pontifice more antiquorum principum adoratus est, ac deinde, omissio Patricii nomine, Imperator et Augnustus appellatus.*

³ The coronation of Charles was partly considered as *translatio imperii* a Graecis ad Francos; partly, and in fact by the emperor himself, as *renovatio imperii*.

⁴ The chroniclers make special mention of the fact that at this time a woman, Irene, sat on the throne of Constantinople.

⁵ Cf. Cap. *Carol.* De honoranda sede Apost. ann. 801. In memoriam b. Petri Apostoli honoremus sanctam Romanam et apostolicam sedem, ut quae nobis sacerdotalis mater est dignitatis esse debeat magistra ecclesiasticae rationis. Quare servanda est cum mansuetudine humilitas; ut licet vix ferendum ab illa sancta sede imponatur jugum, feramus et pia devotione toleremus (*Walter, Corp. juris Germ. ii. 153*). Louis the Mild says of the Church: *Quam Christus . . . nobis regendam tueri* damque commisit (*Walter, l. c. p. 394*).

In confirmation of this close alliance between Church and State, the Pope and the emperor exchanged oaths of fealty ("juramentum fidelitatis") one with the other, not oaths of vassalage. The Pope retained his territorial rights over the States of the Church, and the emperor as such became no vassal to the Pope.

If, from the oath itself, the new relation between the Pope and the emperor is to be considered as co-ordinate, this is still better to be understood from the manner in which the nomination of the bearers of these two highest dignities took place. The canonically elected Pope, before he took possession of his throne, asked the emperor's consent; and he only was acknowledged as emperor who had received this dignity by being crowned by the Pope.¹

§ 88. *The Popes and the Carolingians.*

A friendly understanding existed between Stephen IV. (V.), the successor of Leo III. (+ 816), and Louis the Mild (le Débonnaire). The Pope informed him of his election, and crowned the king emperor at Rheims, as Charlemagne had already appointed him as such.² Paschal I. (817–824), having been consecrated before the arrival of the imperial ambassadors, excused himself to the emperor, whose son Lothaire he (Paschal) at the emperor's request crowned as co-emperor. Louis confirmed and enlarged³ the donations made by his predecessors to the Holy See. At the election of Eugene II. (824–827) some disturbances occurred.⁴ The emperor sent his son Lothaire to Rome,⁵ who recognized Eugene as Pope, and drew up a constitution in which the relative rights and powers between the

¹ Emperor Louis II. writes to the Greek Emperor, Basileus, that his ancestors had not usurped the imperial dignity, "sed Dei nutu et ecclesiae judicio summi pontificis per impositionem et unctionem manus obtinuit." The Frankish kings, and indeed "ii dumtaxat, qui a Romano pontifice ad hoc oleo sancto perfusi sunt," have a claim to the title of emperor. The object of the empire he expresses in these words: Matrem omnium ecclesiarum defendendam atque sublimandam suscepimus (*Baron. Annal. ann. 871*).

² *Einh. Annal. ann. 817.* Stephen also published an ordinance on papal elections (*Corp. juris can. c. 28, dist. 63*). Cf. *Muratori, Script. rer. ital. II. ii. p. 177*; *Hefele, Hist. of the Councils, iv. 7.*

³ *Pertz, Mon. iv. (leg. ii.) p. 7 sqq.* The authenticity of the record of the gift (*Theiner, Cod. diplom. i. 2*) is disputed.

⁴ *Einh. l. c. ann. 824.*

⁵ The Romans took the oath of fidelity to the emperor, "salva fide, quam repromisi Domino Apostolico."

imperial authority and that of Rome and the States of the Church were accurately laid down and defined.¹

Pope Valentine died before the imperial confirmation arrived.

Gregory IV. (827–844) was consecrated after the arrival of the imperial ambassadors.² The attempt of this Pope to effect a peace between Louis and his sons (833) was unsuccessful, and exposed him to many false accusations. His successor Sergius II. (844–847) was consecrated before the arrival of the imperial ambassadors, in order to prevent any violent measures on the part of the Deacon John, who thought of usurping the papal throne.

Lothaire sent his son Louis to Rome³ to resent what he termed a breach of the constitution; but the resolute yet courteous demeanor of Pope Sergius bore down all opposition, and Louis suffered himself to be anointed by the Pope as King of the Lombards, thus practically recognizing his authority.

Leo IV. (847–855) was compelled, on account of the incursions of the Saracens, who in 846 plundered St. Peter's Church, to fortify and defend Rome by building the "Leonine" part of the city. He also was consecrated before receiving the imperial consent; yet this was, as he averred, without prejudice to the fealty which, after God, the Pope owes to the emperor.⁴ Leo bestowed, in 850, the imperial crown on Louis II. After the death of Leo the imperial ambassadors endeavored to raise an excommunicated cardinal (Anastasius)⁵ to the papal throne. But the Romans elected Benedict III. (855–858), who then received episcopal consecration.⁶

The successor of Benedict was St. Nicholas I. (858–867). He was elected and consecrated in the presence of the emperor.⁷ He had severe conflicts with immoral princes⁸ and unworthy prelates. He defended with admirable constancy the indissolubility of Christian marriage against Lothaire II., the vicious king of Lorraine. He was

¹ It consists of nine articles, which treat of the right of the Pope and of the emperor over Rome, stand security for the canonical papal election, provide for the restitution of the alienated Church property, enjoin the Romans to obey and reverence the Pope, etc. Cf. *Harduin, Acta conc.* iv. 125.

² *Einh. Ann.* 827.

³ Cf. *Migne, Patr. lat.* tom. cxi. col. 841 sqq.

⁴ *Migne, l. c.* tom. cxv. col. 629 sqq.

⁵ Leo had excommunicated him. *Migne, l. c.* col. 665.

⁶ *Migne, l. c.* col. 683 sqq.

⁷ *Migne, l. c.* tom. cxix. col. 753 sqq. Whether Nicholas was also crowned is doubtful.

⁸ See § 95.

also compelled to enforce his primatial power against the schismatic Photius of Constantinople;¹ and he endeavored to set ecclesiastical matters on an orderly footing in Bulgaria.² Adrian II. (867-872), at whose election the imperial ambassadors, though present in Rome, were not invited, learned before his death that Ignatius was reinstated as Patriarch of Constantinople in lieu of the intruder Photius. He was not equally happy with regard to the succession question in Lorraine. He impaired his authority by taking the part of Carloman, a son of Charles the Bald, and a renegade monk; also by siding with Hinemar, Bishop of Laon, against his uncle Hinemar, Archbishop of Rheims.

His successor, John VIII. (872-882), a very active and energetic ruler,⁴ after the death of Louis II., crowned Charles the Bald⁵ as emperor, passing over Louis the German. And after the death of Charles (877), the Pope, from among the three candidates for the throne,—Carloman, Louis the Stammerer, and Charles the Fat.—selected the last-named for the imperial crown in the year 881. But he could only prevent an invasion of the Saracens into the Roman territory by paying tribute, and it was in vain that he sought to restrain haughty bishops and irrepressible laymen by excommunicating them. He died by the hand of an assassin in 882.

The Spoletan faction now exerted themselves to have one of their own style of thinking elevated to the papal chair; but the clergy and the people elected the excellent Marinus I. (882-884). After his early death two friends of the Spoletan faction ascended the papal throne,—Adrian III. (+ 885), who decreed that the Pope canonically elected should be consecrated without the presence of the imperial ambassadors; and Stephen V. (VI.), who was consecrated immediately after his election, but who satisfied the emperor by forwarding to him the deed of his election.⁶

Under the pontificate of Stephen, in the year 888, Charles III. was deposed in Tribur, because he was found incapable either of

¹ See § 101.

² See § 84. For his zeal in Church discipline, see *Thiel, De Nic. pap. I. commentationes duae historico-canonicæ*. Brunsberg, 1859.

³ For Adrian II., see *Migne*, l. c. tom. cxxii. col. 1245 sqq.

⁴ *Migne*, l. c. tom. cxxvi. col. 647 sqq.

⁵ Adrian II. had already given him the reversion of it. Cf. *Epist. ad Carol. Calv. (Jaffé) Regest. Rom. pontif. n. 2241*, p. 259.

⁶ Cf. *Migne*, l. c. tom. cxxvi. col. 967 sqq. Concerning Stephen, tom. cxxix. col. 786 sqq., cf. *Annal. Fuld. ann. 885*.

protecting the empire from foes from without, or of maintaining order and discipline within.¹

The death of Charles led to the dissolution of the Carlovingian dynasty,² and to the formation of reckless factions, which gave rise to frequent conflicts. The warfare raged most violently in Italy, where Guido of Spoleto, and Berengarius of Friuli, a grandson of Louis the Mild, contended for the royal crown. Berengarius was defeated, and in the year 891 Guido was crowned emperor by Pope Stephen V. (VI.).

Stephen died in 891, and was succeeded by Cardinal Formosus,³ Bishop of Porto, whom John VIII. had excommunicated, but who had been relieved from the ban by Marinus. Although no friend to the Spoletons, the Pope at first lived in a good understanding with Guido, whose son Lambert he in 892 crowned as co-emperor. But after the death of Guido (893), the Pope, fearing the overwhelming power of the Spoletons, invited the German king, Arnulph, to Italy; and after defeating Lambert (896), this king received from the Pope the imperial crown, and from the Romans the oath of fealty.⁴ When, however, he found that power failed him to enforce his ordinances and commands, the emperor again quitted Italy, whereupon the Spoleton faction seized the reins of government and took dire revenge on their enemies. Formosus died in imprisonment (896). Here a time of lamentable degradation ensued for the Holy See,—all owing to the fierce contentions of rival parties; from 896 to 904 there were nine Popes. Of these, Boniface VI. survived his elevation only fifteen days.⁵ Stephen VI. or VII. (+ 897) succeeded him; this Pope rejected Arnulph, crowned Lambert emperor, and insulted Pope Formosus in his grave.⁶ He himself was seized and strangled

¹ Cf. Cone. *Troslejan*, ap. *Harduin*, vi. 1, col. 505.

² It fell into five parts,—Germany, France, Italy, Burgundy, and Arelat.

³ On Stephen V., Formosus, and Stephen VI., see *Migne*, l. c. tom. cxxix. col. 785 sqq.

⁴ The Roman people swore fidelity to the emperor, “*salvo honore et lege mea atque fidelitate Domini Formosi papae.*”

⁵ *Annal. Fuldi*, ann. 896.

⁶ Respecting the fact authorities agree, but not respecting the instigators of the deed. The acts of the Roman Synod under Pope John IX., 898 (see p. 258, n. 1), and *Auxilius*, *De ordinationibus a Formoso factis*, lib. 2 (*Migne*, l. c. tom. cxxix. col. 1053 sqq.), say that Pope Stephen had the corpse of Formosus exhumed and arraigned before his judgment-seat. *Luitprand*, *Antapodosis*, i. 30 (*Pertz*, *Mon. v.* 264 sqq.), calls (probably erroneously) the latter Pope Sergius III. According to *Luitprand*, the mutilation of the corpse of Formosus, by the command of Sergius (or of Stephen), who was sitting in judgment upon him, was effected in accordance with c. 9 of the Roman Council, but by the hands of treasure-seekers. Cf. c. 1.

by a hostile faction at Rome. Then, after the short reign of Romanus and Theodore II., John IX. (898-900) was raised to the papal throne. This Pope nullified at a Roman synod all the proceedings against Formosus, restored to their sees all such bishops as had been ordained by him (Formosus), and confirmed Lambert as emperor.¹

The assertion that a female named Johanna ascended the papal throne after Leo IV. and before Benedict III. is disproved by the indubitable fact that Benedict immediately succeeded Leo IV.² Moreover, the fable appeared only in the thirteenth century, with Stephen de Borbonne (+ 1261) and Martinus Polonus (+ 1279).

§ 89. *Tenth Century. — Condition of the Apostolic See. — The Saxon Emperors.*

The downfall of the Carlovingians was the occasion of great political and religious disorders. Italy suffered severely from the wounds inflicted upon her by the continual internal feuds among her factious nobility; and from without she was sore beset by invasions of plundering hordes of Hungarians and Saracens; well might she be said to be bleeding at every pore, for the rules of discipline and piety gave way to a frivolity and shamelessness which manifested themselves in writing as well as in life, and against which the power of the Church could enforce itself so much the less in that these factious nobles had appropriated to themselves a great part of the ecclesiastical property and arbitrarily disposed of the Church benefices.

In the tenth century the condition of public affairs in Italy was at its worst. In the north of the peninsula Louis of Provence and Berengarius of Friuli were contending for the royal crown. The marauding expeditions of the Saracens and Hungarians extended from north and from south, as far as Rome itself. The Eternal City was a prey to tyranny and a factious nobility, who not only wrested to itself the reins of temporal power, but exercised a most deplorable influence on the interior concerns of the Church.

Among the various factions, the Tuscan party maintained the ascendancy for about fifty years; at its head were three dissolute women,—Theodora the elder, Theodora the younger, and Marozia, the two latter being daughters of the former,—and these exercised almost unlimited sway in Rome, interfering even with the appoint-

¹ *Harduin*, *Acta conc.* vi. 1, col. 487.

² *Palma*, *Prael. hist. eccl.*, i. 367 sqq. Cf. *Hincmar Rhemens*, Ep. 26.

ments to the Apostolic See in a manner that precluded all freedom of election.

Owing to the scanty reports that have come down to us of this time, and yet more owing to the party spirit that pervaded the editing of these reports, it is difficult to sketch a faithful picture of this lamentable period; but this much seems to be ascertained by a critical examination of the information given us, and of the completion of the sources whence such information is derived, namely, that the accusations made against several Popes of this century are partly without foundation and partly overdrawn.

At the beginning of the tenth century the meek and pious Benedict IV. (900–903), who crowned Louis of Provence emperor, was elected Pope.¹ His pontificate passed without any considerable difficulty. On the other hand, Leo V. was, a month after his election, imprisoned at the instigation of his chaplain Christopher, and probably strangled.² Six months later the same fate occurred to Christopher himself, who had seized on the papal throne. He succumbed to Sergius III., the candidate of the Tuscan party, and died in prison.³

Contradictory reports have come down to us respecting the character of Sergius III. The uncritical and slanderous Luitprand⁴ gives a very unfavorable picture of the life of this Pope, who possessed eminent gifts of mind. . . . Two contemporaries of Sergius, John the Deacon⁵ and Flodoard of Rheims⁶ (+ 966), express a different judgment; their statements accord with the words of his epitaph, which represent him as “an excellent pastor, beloved by all classes.”

For the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, Sergius III. (+ 911) held several synods, at which the validity of the ordinations conferred by Formosus was again discussed.⁷ He was succeeded by two worthy

¹ *Migne*, l. c. tom. exxxi. col. 40 sqq.

² Cf. *Pagi*, *Critica ann.* 903, n. 2.

³ *Migne*, l. c. tom. exxxi. col. 972 sqq.

⁴ *Antapodosis*, ii. 48. On the confidence to be placed in *Luitprand*, see *Kopp*, *Historical Sheets from Switzerland*, i. 216 ff.; *Koepke*, *De vita et scriptis Luitprandi*, etc. *Berol.* 1842.

⁵ *Joh. Diae.* (about 1169), *De eccl. Lateran. ap.* *Migne*, *Patr. lat. tom. exciv.* col. 1559.

⁶ *Migne*, *Patr. lat. tom. exxxv. col. 831.* *Damberger*, a. a. O. *critikheft*, p. 123.

⁷ Sergius had the ruined Lateran Church rebuilt: he adjusted the quarrel between Bremen-Hamburg on the one side and Mentz and Cologne on the other; and restored the connection with the Greek Church once again by granting to the emperor, Leo the Philosopher, permission to be married for the fourth time, and by holding through his legates a synod in Constantinople (*Damberger*, vol. iv.). The Abbey of Clugny was built during his pontificate.

Popes, Anastasius III. (911-913) and Lando (+ 914). After which John X., Archbishop of Ravenna, ascended the chair of St. Peter.

The narrative of Luitprand, stating that John X.'s accession to the papal throne was the result of a love affair between him and the elder Theodora, bears the stamp of falsehood on its front, and is besides refuted by the character of this Pope, and the eulogies he received from his contemporary Flodoard and the unknown panegyrist of Berengarius. As the head of the Church, John X. was a powerful ruler. In the year 916 he bestowed the imperial crown upon Berengarius of Friuli, and with the assistance of the Greeks and of some Italian princes, he defeated the Saracens on the banks of the Garigliano. In order to restore order to Rome, he entered into an alliance with Hugh of Provence (*malus*), who after the assassination of Berengarius ruled in upper Italy (925). The Tuscan party, headed by the Margrave Guido, husband of Marozia, frustrated his plan. Peter, the brother of the Pope, was murdered before his very eyes, and John X. himself died in prison (June, 928). Then once again Marozia (*Senatrix*) ruled over Rome, and after the short reigns of Leo VI. and of Stephen VII. (VIII.), succeeded in having her son by her first husband, Margrave Alberic of Tuscany, elected Pope in 931, under the name of John XI.¹

Upon the death of Guido, Marozia gave her hand to Hugh of Provence. But on the wedding-day itself her son Alberic III. took forcible possession of the government, drove away his step-father, and shut up his mother in prison. Pope John XI. also became entirely subjected to his brother's power.

Under the powerful rule of Alberic, and after the death of John XI., Leo VII., a pious and worthy man, was canonically elected. To him succeeded, after a tumultuous election, Stephen VIII. (IX.) in 939,—an excellent Pope, who, like his predecessor, kept up a lively intercourse with St. Odo of Clugny.

The saintly Marinus II. (943-946), *pater patriae*, and Agapetus II. (946-955), labored for the welfare of the Church, though they often met with great difficulties. On the death of the latter, Alberic's son Octavian, the coadjutor of Agapetus II., who was already in possession of the temporal power of Rome, ascended the apostolic throne under the name of John XII.²

Meanwhile Berengarius of Ivrea had driven King Hugh from Italy (946), and after the death of Lothaire, Hugh's son, who was but a semi-

¹ Of the Popes John X. to Stephen VII., see *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxxxii.

² Cf. *Migne*, l. c. tom. cxxxiii.

blance of a king, had himself assumed the government of Italy (950). In order to strengthen his government, he desired to marry his son, whom he had associated with himself in his regency, to Adelaide, widow of Lothaire. On the refusal of the unfortunate widow to accede to this, she was so harshly treated that, with other malecontents, she had recourse for help to the German king, Otho I. This king came to Italy, and defeated Berengarius; but the condition of his own country (the revolt of his son Liudolph) obliged him to return home before he had been crowned emperor by Pope Agapetus II.

The transaction of Berengarius by which he reduced Italy to a fief of the German Empire was by no means calculated to restore tranquillity, and Otho was compelled a second time to take up arms for the chastisement of his faithless vassal. Towards the end of the year 961 the king, invited by the much-suffering Pope John XII., crossed the Alps, and made his entry — but not before he had taken an oath to maintain and defend the rights of the Pope¹ — into the Eternal City, where, in 962, he was crowned emperor; the imperial throne having been vacant forty-six years.

After this, Otho, who by a special document had guaranteed the rights and possessions of the Pope, turned his arms against Berengarius in upper Italy, while John XII., becoming mistrustful from Otho's appearance, entered into secret negotiations with the Greeks and Hungarians. This naturally created a rupture between him and the emperor. All attempts at reconciliation failed. Otho turned back with his army towards Rome, the gates of which had been opened by the anti-imperialists to the son of Berengarius, Adalbert, who now occupied the city with his Saracen freebooters. Pope John XII. and Adalbert both fled; and without a single blow from his sword, Otho entered Rome, the inhabitants of which were compelled to promise under oath “not to elect a Pope without the consent and choice of Otho or of his son.”²

¹ There were three formulas of oaths (*Pertz*, *Mon. iv. leg. ii. 29*). The Emperor promises : 1. *Sanctam Rom. eccl. et te (Joh. pap.) rectorem ipsius exaltabo secundum meum posse*, etc. 2. *In Roma nullum placitum neque ordinationem faciam de omnibus, quae ad te vel ad tnos Romanos pertinent sine tuo consilio*. 3. *Quidquid de terra sancti Petri ad nostram potestatem venerit, tibi reddam*. 4. *Cuiuscumque regnum Italicum commisero jurare tibi faciam illum, ut adjutor tui sit, ad defendendam terram sancti Petri secundum suum posse*.

² *Luitprand*, l. c. c. 8 : *Cives vero imperatorem sanctum cum suis omnibus in urbem suscipiunt, fidelitatem reprobunt : hoc addentes et firmiter jurantes, nunquam se papam electuros aut ordinaturos praeter consensum et electionem domini imperatoris Ottonis caesaris augusti filii ipsius regis Ottonis.*

Then the emperor, of his own authority, convoked a synod in order to investigate, under his own presidency, the crimes imputed to John XII. The Pope, who had rejected the summons to appear before said synod, was by it deposed for breach of faith, and other transgressions against religion and morality. The election of a successor to the Holy See took place in as uncanonical a manner as this proceeding of the synod against John XII. It was by imperial authority and influence that a layman was elected, in violation of all electoral right and freedom, to the papal throne, by the title of Leo VIII.

It needed all the power of the mighty emperor to protect Leo VIII. from the Roman people; and as soon as Otho had left the city they renounced all obedience to this Pope. A civil war broke out. Leo fled to Otho's camp. John XII. again took possession of the papal throne, and retaliated on his enemies. On the 26th February, 964, he held a synod. The majority of the members had already taken part in the previous synod convoked by the emperor, and had voted for the deposition of the Pope. They now reversed their decision, declared all accusations brought against John to be without foundation, and anathematized Leo as usurper of the Holy See.

John XII. died in a few weeks after his restoration to power (May, 964). The Romans then elected Benedict V., who, however, had to quit the city and leave the papal crown to Leo, whom Otho brought back to Rome. In his exile he betook himself to Hamburg, where he died in the odor of sanctity.¹

The savage and miserable spirit of party still survived under the successor of Leo, John XIII. One part of the nobility opposed the Pope and cast him into prison, from which he was freed by the Crescentians.² To restore order, the emperor crossed the Alps for the third time, chastised the rebellious Romans, and restored the Exarchate of Ravenna to the Pope. John XIII., however, crowned Otho II. as co-emperor. John XIII. died 6th September, 972, and Benedict VI. was elected Pope in the presence of the imperial ambassadors. But on the news of the death of the Emperor Otho I., the fear of the overwhelming German power vanished, and Count Crescentius, Lord of Nomentum, as the head of the national party, raised the standard of revolt. The Pope was strangled (974); and the Cardinal-deacon Franco was placed on the papal throne, under

¹ *Luitprand*, l. c. 20 sqq.

² At its head stood John Crescentius, named "marmoreo," to distinguish him from his son, the young Crescentius Numentanus or Cencius.

the name of Boniface VII. The Romans, however, resisted him as a creature of the Crescentians; and when Otho II. drew near to the city, the pseudo-Pope fled to Constantinople.

With the consent of the emperor, Benedict VII. (975-983) was elected supreme head of the Church;¹ and, assisted by the emperor, he occupied himself in restoring to order the perplexing confusion that bewildered the Church.²

His successor, John XIV., was overthrown by Cardinal Boniface, who, on the death of Otho II., returned from Constantinople. He died in prison. His victor, Boniface, soon followed him; some say that he was murdered by his own party.

Pope John XV., being hard-pressed by the younger Crescentius, appealed to Otho III. for help, but died ere the emperor made his entry into Rome.

Bruno, the nephew of Otho, was now raised to the papal chair under the name of Gregory V. (996-999). He was the first German Pope, and he bestowed the imperial crown upon the king. Another attempt at insurrection, set on foot by Crescentius, who brought forward John of Piacenza as anti-Pope, was suppressed by the emperor.

After the premature death of Gregory, the celebrated Gerbert, tutor to the emperor and Archbishop of Ravenna, became head of the Church under the name of Sylvester II.³ He was the first French Pope.

§ 90. *The Popes and the Frankish Emperors up to the Time of Gregory VII.*

The pontificates of John XVI. (+ 1003), of John XVII. (1003-1009), and of Sergius IV. (1009-1012), passed without any remarkable occurrences. Benedict VIII. (1012-1024), one of the most excellent Popes, crowned St. Henry II. (1014) emperor;⁴ and this monarch powerfully supported the Pope in his reformatory measures, so that the spiritual and temporal powers at that time were in perfect harmony. John XIX. (+ 1033), a brother of Benedict VIII.,

¹ The rumor that, after Benedict, Domnus had possession of the papal chair for a short time rests on a misunderstanding.

² Life and writings of the Popes Benedict VII. till Gregory V., see *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxxxvii.

³ *Vita et script. ap. Migne*, l. c. tom. cxxxix. col. 85 sqq.

⁴ The Pope in 1020 visited the emperor in Bamberg, and there a new document concerning the state of the Church and papal elections was drawn up. Cf. *Theiner*, Cod. dipl. i. 7.

obtained the Papacy, as some assert, by purchase. He bestowed the imperial crown on Conrad II. (1027), the first Franconian emperor.¹ This Pope kept up a friendly intercourse with the celebrated Abbey of Clugny. After his death, Count Alberic of Tusculum succeeded in having his son Theophylact, an inexperienced youth, elected Pope. Benedict IX., the new Pope, who was ill-treated by his relatives, led a life which ill-accorded with his high dignity, although the gross accusations brought against him lack proof.² The fall of his relatives also caused his fall (1044). Then John, Bishop of Sabina, Sylvester III., ascended the throne as anti-Pope, but after a reign of forty days was driven from Rome by the family of Benedict, who had returned thither.³ Finally, Benedict, for a sum of money, resigned his position in favor of the pious archpriest Gratian, who, as Gregory VI., governed with energy. But Benedict soon repented of his act of renunciation, and again asserted his claims to the papal dignity, so that now there were three persons contending one with the other for the throne of Peter.⁴

The threatened danger of a schism was happily averted by the interference of King Henry III. Under his protection the reform synods of Pavia and Sutri (1046) were held. Sylvester was adjudged to imprisonment in a cloister for simony. Benedict's claims were not even taken into account. Gregory VI. resigned his dignity of his own accord.

On this the candidate recommended by the king, Suidger, Bishop of Bamberg, was elected Pope, as Clement II. (1046–1047).⁵ He crowned Henry as emperor. His successor, Poppo of Brixen (Damasus II.), died shortly after his consecration.⁶ Against him Benedict IX. reappeared, but afterwards repented and retired to a monastery (+ 1055).

After the sudden death of these two Popes, no German bishop was

¹ *Migne*, l. c. tom. exli. col. 1111 sqq.

² Benedict IX. was a nephew of John XIX. Concerning him, cf. *Migne*, l. c. tom. exli. col. 1341. *Watterich*, *Vita Rom. pontif.* i. 71 sqq.

³ Benedict had been driven away in 1038, but had been brought back to Rome by Conrad II. On the events of the year 1044, see *Annales Romani ap. Pertz*, vii. 468. *Watterich*, l. c. i. 72.

⁴ Some sources inform us that one of the Popes had established himself in St. Peter's, the other in the Lateran, and the third in St. Mary Major's.

⁵ Clement was not raised to the papal throne by Henry III., but by election. See *Will.* a. a. O. p. 6, 7.

⁶ He was nominated by the emperor, on which account Bonizo says of him: Sedem pontificiam invasit. *Will.* a. a. O. pp. 6, 7.

willing to present himself as a candidate for the papal dignity. At length, however, at the Diet of Worms, at which the Roman delegates were present, Bruno, Bishop of Toul,¹ accepted the choice which had fallen upon him, on the condition that the clergy and people of Rome should voluntarily elect him Pope.² When this was done, Bruno, who had been accompanied to Rome by Hildebrand, a distinguished monk of Clugny, took possession of the papal chair under the name of Leo IX. (1049–1054). He was both virtuous and energetic, and at once took the most stringent measures for the suppression of simony and concubinage.³ During his pontificate the separation of the Greek Church from Rome was completely carried into effect by the Patriarch Michael Cerularius.⁴

Leo IX. was succeeded by Gebhardt, Bishop of Eichstädt (Victor II.), who for two years governed the Church in the spirit of his predecessor (1055–1057). Being pressingly invited thereto by the sick emperor, the Pope came to Germany (1056), and after Henry's death, undertook the charge of his widow and heir to the throne. The Pope died at Arezzo, in 1057, on his way back to Rome.

His successor was Frederic, Abbot of Monte Casino, Stephen IX. (X.), who reigned only seven months.

After his death the Counts of Tusculum attempted to raise the Bishop John Minzius of Velletri to the papal throne. But the cardinals protested against the intrusion, and after Hildebrand's return from Germany, they elected, at Siena, Bishop Gerard of Florence as Nicholas II. (1058–1061). The anti-Pope was compelled to submit to him.

The manifold disorders which until this time had occurred in the election of Popes induced Nicholas II. to pass a decree on papal election in the year 1059. This decree chiefly concedes to the cardinals (cardinal bishops) the right to inaugurate a new election, and so to conduct it that the wishes of the clergy and people of Rome should be respected, and the honor and reverence due to the future emperor Henry (IV.) be in no way impaired; that, if possible, the elected candidate should be one belonging to the heart ("gremium") of the Roman Church, could any fit person be found in it; that, should certain circumstances render it advisable, the election may

¹ *Vitae Leonis ap. Watterich*, i. 93 sqq.

² *Watterich*, i. 96.

³ See § 96.

⁴ See § 101. *Bruno* says of Leo IX., *Sigil. l. c.* : Erat nobilis genere, forma speciosus, sed speciosior sanctitate, litteris instructus, doctrina potens, moribus ornatus, et quaecunque huic ordini necessaria sunt, simul in eo cuncta convenerant.

take place outside of Rome, and that the elected Pope, even before he is enthroned, may exercise all the rights¹ appertaining to his papal dignity.

The main object of these regulations, the violation of which was threatened with anathema, was to paralyze the influence of the party of the nobility in Rome or nullify it altogether. In order to counteract more effectually this spirit of party, Nicholas II. concluded at Melfi a treaty with Robert Guiscard, a Norman Prince, by which this prince became a vassal of the Roman Church.²

Nicholas is said to have modified this decree of 1059, at a synod of Rome held at Easter-tide 1061,³ when he withdrew the right of the future emperor to participate in the election of Popes, that he

¹ Various readings of this decree are in existence. We give *Gratian's* criticism (can. i. dist. 23), and subjoin the different reading given by the Codex Udalrici (*Jaffé*, Monum. Bambergensia, p. 41 sqq.) within brackets. The decree determines: Ut obennte hujus Romanae ecclesiae universalis pontifice, imprimis cardinales episcopi, [cardinales] diligentissima simul consideratione tractantes [tractent] mox sibi clericos cardinales adlibeant, sicque reliquus clerus et populus [mox sibi *to* populus is wanting in C. U.] ad consensum novae electionis accedant, ut nimurum, ne venalitatis morbis qualibet occasione subripiat, religiosi viri [eum filio nostro rege Henrico] praeduces sint in promovenda pontificis electione, reliqui autem sequaces. Eligant autem de ipsis ecclesiae gremio, si repertus fuerit [reperitur] idoneus, vel si de ipsa non invenitur ex alia assumatur. Salvo debito honore et reverentia dilecti nostri filii [filii nostri] Henrici qui impraesentiarum rex habetur et futurus imperator Deo concedente speratur, sicut jam sibi [sicut jam sibi mediante ejus nuntio Longobardiae cancellario Wiberto] concessimus et successorum [successor] illius, qui ab hac apostolica sede personaliter hoc ius impetraverint. [The sentence *Salvo to impetraverint* follows in C. U. immediately after *tractent*.] Quod si pravorum atque iniquum horonimatum ita perversitas invaluerit, ut pura, sincera, atque gratuita electio fieri in Urbe non possit, cardinales episcopi cum religiosis clericis catholicisque laicis [card. *to* laicis is wanting in C. U.] licet pauci sint, jus tamen potestatis obtineant eligendi apostolicae sedis pontificem, ubi [eum invictissimo rege] congruentius judicaverint. Plane postquam electio fuerit facta, si bellica tempestas vel qualiscumque hominum conatus restiterit, ut is qui electus est, in apostolicam sedem intronizari non valeat, electus tamen sicut papa auctoritatem obtineat regendi Rom. ecclesiam et disponendi omnes facultates illius.

² Leo IX. had already led an army against the Normans in lower Italy, but was taken prisoner by them, on which Robert Guiscard, their leader, received lower Italy and Sicily as fiefs from the Apostolic See. The oath taken by Robert is recorded in *Watterich*, i. 233, 234.

³ *Harduin*, vi. 1, 1064. *Watterich*, i. 211. By this new decree the Pope is said to have taken back or revoked the concessions made to King Henry IV. *Hefele*, (Hist. of the Councils, iv. 778) denies this, and appeals to Peter Damian (Opuscul. iv. vol. 3, col. 51 sqq. ed. 1783. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. exlv. col. 67 sqq. Cf. *Harduin*, vi. 1, 1119 sqq.).

might not place a man of his own choice on the papal chair. In fact, it happened, after the death of Nicholas, that the enemies of the Church, at an assembly of Basle presided over by King Henry IV., succeeded in having the election of Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, who took the name of Alexander II. (1061-1073), annulled, and Cadalus, Bishop of Parma, appointed in his place. This was the anti-Pope Honorius II. But neither the violence of power nor the inducement of money could procure recognition for the intruder. Christendom remained faithful to the lawful Pope, who was at length recognized in Germany also, under the administration of Hanno, Archbishop of Cologne.¹

§ 91. *Political Position of the Prelates.—Advantages and Disadvantages of this Position in regard to the Church.*

Among the Germanic nations, the bishops and abbots, in consequence of existing institutions and of the position of the secular power, were placed, in reference to their rights as citizens, in a situation altogether different from that occupied by the spiritual authorities in the Roman Empire; for they were vassals of the crown, and of the States of the empire.

Even during the reign of the Merovingians the bishops and abbots had held a portion of the crown-lands as fiefs, which made them vassals of the king, to whom they were obliged to take the oath of fealty (the homagium), and to do homage for them after their election.

Another consequence of the feudal system was the right, attached to the holding of these lands, of the prelates to appear at the diets of the empire, and to take part in the consultations and decrees. As the bishops appeared at the diets, it often happened that ecclesiastical matters were brought under discussion by the dignitaries of the Church assembled there. This influential political position of the prelates was both advantageous and prejudicial to the Church.

The advantages may be summed up thus: the chief pastors of the Church could labor with greater advantage among the people; they could gradually infuse a Christian spirit into legislation, such as recognizing the Christian principles on marriage, etc.

On the other hand, the chief disadvantage was the undue influence which the State exercised in the appointment of bishops and abbots. Certainly temporal princes had a right to claim a certain

¹ *Vitae Alex. ap. Watterich*, i. 235 sqq.

part in the appointment of bishops and abbots, but too often they overstepped their faculties, either by recommending men of their own selection to fill the vacant places, or by filling them themselves per force, by which they intended to elevate men on whose political fidelity they could depend, rather than to select such as by their vocation to the spiritual state, and by their capacity to fulfil its functions, would govern the Church discreetly and in the true spirit of Christianity.

This practice, which is so repugnant to the real spirit of the Church, was already prevalent during the reign of the Merovingians. Charles Martel even considered the monasteries as a kind of hospitals for invalid generals, whom he appointed abbots, calling them lay-abbots, "abbates strenui," "abbacomites."¹ This scandal continued during the reigns of the Carlovingian kings, in spite of the protests of ecclesiastical superiors; and this, although Charlemagne had guaranteed freedom of election.² In the tenth century the evil reached its height. It went so far that noble families forced their children,³

¹ *Gesta Abbatum Fontanellensium*, c. 11 (*Pertz, Mon.* ii. 284), thus describes a lay abbot: *Wido sortitur locum regiminis* (scil. monast. *Fontanell.*); *hic namque propinquus Caroli principis fuit, qui etiam monasterium seti Vedasti quod est Atrebateni territorio jure regiminis tenuit anno uno sicut et istud.* Erat autem de saecularibus clericis, gladioque quem semispacium vocant, semper accinctus, sagaque pro cappa utebatur, parumque ecclesiasticae disciplinae imperiis parebat. *Nam copiam canum multiplicem semper habebat, cum qua venationi quotidie insistebat, sagittatorque praecipuis in areibus ligneis ad aves feriendas erat, hisce operibus magis quam ecclesiasticae disciplinae studiis se exercebat.* (Cf. c. 15.) *Conc. Troslejanum* (909), c. 3. *Nunc in monasteri Deo dicatis monachorum, canonicorum, sanctimonialium abbates laici cum suis uxoribus, filiis et filiabus, cum militibus morantur et canibus, etc.* Charles Martel also conferred bishoprics as rewards for military service.

² He commanded, *ut episcopi per electionem cleri et populi secundum statuta canonum de proprio dioecesi remota personarum et munerum acceptance, ob vitae meritum et sapientiae donum eligantur, etc.* *Capit. Aquisgran.* ann. 803, c. 2. (*Baluz, Capit. regum Franc.* i. 718. *Walter, Corp. juris Germ.* ii. 171.) Louis the Mild confirmed this ordinance. Yet this same emperor gave away monasteries to lay abbots. Cf. *Capit. i. ann. 823, c. 8*, in which Louis declares: *Abbatibus quoque et laicis specialiter jubemus, ut in monasteriis, quae ex nostra largitate habent, etc.* (*Walter, i. c. p. 358*).

³ Count Herman of Vermandois obliged the church of Rheims to receive his five-year-old son as bishop, and even obtained the papal confirmation. In like manner in Italy boys were appointed bishops. *Atto, Ep. Vercell.* in his "De pressuris ecclesiasticis," part ii., utters bitter complaints against this abuse. *Migne, Patr. lat. tom. xxxiv. col. 74j*: *Quidam autem adeo mente et corpore obeaccantur, ut ipsos etiam parvulos ad pastoralem promovere curam non dubitent, quos nec mente nec corpore idoneos esse constet.* Et qui adhuc nec ipsa rudimenta humanae naturae sufficerint discere, hos ad magisterium elevare non formidant, judicesque constitunnt animarum, qui adhuc

while yet minors, into bishoprics and abbeys, or rather enforced the payment of revenues derived from such sources to their use.

The Saxon Emperors also frequently violated the prerogatives of the Church, although it must be acknowledged to their honor, that their selection for the most part fell on able and worthy men.¹

Not less injurious to the Church than this arbitrary appointment of prelates by temporal rulers, was the bad habit which some of them had, of leaving the bishop's sees and abbeies vacant,² that they might appropriate the revenues to themselves.

But the worst consequence arising from the undue influence exercised by temporal rulers in ecclesiastical matters showed itself in the fact that practically the temporal power of the prelates came to be considered as of primary importance, to which their spiritual dignity was a mere accessory. Such a misconception was highly favored by the custom that gradually gained ground, of bestowing the temporal enfeoffment at the same time with the insignia of ecclesiastical authority, the ring and erosier (investiture).

Another disadvantage of the feudal homage required of the prelates was that their oath of fealty required them to serve the king in war when called upon. This obliged them, and that not seldom, to leave a portion of their territories to laymen, as fiefs, and to take part in battles, instead of fulfilling the duties of their vocation.

It was also seriously injurious to ecclesiastical discipline that the prelates were so frequently overwhelmed with mundane affairs, and that in consequence of their temporal position they were often involved in contentions with their feudal tenantry.

§ 92. *Royal Messengers.—Church Property.—Guardians of Churches and Monasteries.*

The institution of royal messengers was of great service to Church and State. The royal messengers ("missi dominici")³ were

quid anima sit intelligere penitus nequeunt. Et qui docere populum instanter debuerant de divinis, doceri de saecularibus et etiam vilibus praceptorum verberibus incipiunt. Et qui vereri ab omnibus debuerant, ipsos etiam scholasticos timent.

¹ Otho I. nominated his brother, St. Bruno, to the Archbishopric of Cologne, his brother William to the Archbishopric of Mentz, and his cousin Henry to the Archbishopric of Treves. The Emperor Conrad II. interfered singularly with the freedom of election.

² Under Louis the Mild, and during the reigns of his sons, many bishoprics were left without a bishop.

³ *Thomassin*, *Vetus et nova eccl. discipl.* ii. 3, c. 92. *Phillips*, *German Hist.* ii. 403.

commonly a bishop and a count, who in the domain assigned to them ("missaticum") were, by a special royal instruction, to exercise supreme supervision in that domain; namely, to oversee the administration of the count, and to give information to the king in all matters concerning it, as also to inspect the condition of the monasteries, the conduct of the people, etc., for the same purpose.

From pious donations¹ and bequests, as also by the payment of tithes, and the breaking up of the soil by the labor of the monks, in cultivating lands that had hitherto lain as waste, the Church had gradually come into possession of considerable property which, according to the ancient ecclesiastical law, was to be applied to the maintenance of the churches, of the clergy, and other good purposes, and by royal ordinance was exempted from taxation. This did not, however, prevent some secular rulers from exacting large sums from some individual churches and monasteries, nor others from plundering their possessions and inflicting great injury upon them by the right of spoliation ("jus spolii"). Charles Martel was noted for his encroachments on the property of the Church.

The defence of the rights and possessions of the churches and of the monasteries formed the duty of the gowns-men ("advocati togati"), who also had the care of the bondsmen, to protect whom against exterior enemies armed guardians ("advocati armati") were provided. These guardians not infrequently became themselves the oppressors of the churches and monasteries intrusted to them; and, to put an end to such an abuse, both civil and ecclesiastical laws were enacted.

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 93. *The Bishop and his Diocese. — Origin of the Cathedral and Collegiate Chapters. — Cardinals.*

SYNODS repeatedly inculcated on the bishops the duty incumbent on them to visit their sees, to take measures to prevent strange priests from going about, to keep a watchful eye on their own

¹ Either unconditional surrender of the soil to the Church, or in the form of a gift held at pleasure of the giver, granting the usufruct for life.

clergy; at the same time special laws were enacted to protect the diocesan clergy from capricious and arbitrary treatment.¹

The ancient right of the bishop to dispose of all the ecclesiastical places of his diocese underwent a limitation by the patronal right, which was granted to such as founded churches or parishes. This right, or rather privilege, led to many abuses, that in certain cases made the jurisdiction of the bishop altogether illusory; sometimes such jurisdiction was even claimed by those to whom the kings accorded churches as fiefs, by which it not seldom happened that all the income of the church, even the surplice-fees, were drawn by another, and a very small stipend was allotted to the priest.

As the kings in their palaces, so also the counts in their castles, erected private oratories and had their own chaplains,—an arrangement which was the more detrimental from the fact that these chaplains were but too often uneducated men, who received unworthy treatment from their lords, and being out of the way of the bishop's surveillance, might easily loosen the restraints of moral discipline.² To prevent this disorder, the councils insisted more forcibly on the prohibition of "absolute ordinations,"—that is, of an ordination without previous appointment to a particular church,—and set obstacles in the way of erecting private oratories, or sought to obviate the disadvantages by particular provisions.

Following the example of St. Augustine and of other bishops,

¹ *Thomassin*, *Vetus et nova eccl. discipl.* ii. 3, c. 78 sqq.

² Agobard of Lyons gives the following sketch of these domestic chaplains: *In*crepuit consuetudo impia, ut paene nullus inveniatur anhelans, et quanituluncunque praeficiens ad honores et gloriam temporalem, qui non domesticum habeat sacerdotem, non cui obediat, sed a quo incessanter exigat licitam simul atque illicitam obedientiam non solum in divinis officiis, verum etiam in humanis, ita ut plerique inveniantur, qui aut ad mensam ministrant, aut saccata vina miscent, aut canes ducant, aut caballos, quibus foeminae sedent, regant, aut agellos provideant. Et quia tales, de quibus haec dicimus, bonos sacerdotes in domibus suis habere non possunt (nam quis esset bonus clericus qui cum talibus hominibus dehonestari nomen et vitam suam ferret?) non erant omnino quales clerici isti sint, quanta ignorantia coeui, quantis criminibus involuti: tantum ut habeant presbyteros proprios quorum occasione deserant ecclesias seniores et officia publica. Quod autem non habeant eos propter religionis honorem, appareat ex hoc, quod non habent eos in honore. Unde et contumeliose eos nominantes, quando volunt illos ordinari presbyteros, rogant nos aut jubent, dicentes: *Habeo unum clericonem*, quem mihi nutriti de servis meis propriis, aut beneficialibus, sive pagensibus, aut obtinui ab illo vel illo homine, sive de illo vel illo pago: *volo ut ordines eum mihi presbyterum*. Cumque factum fuerit, putant ex hoc, quod majoris ordinis sacerdotes non eis sint necessarii, et derelinquent frequenter publica officia et praedicamenta (*De priv. et jure sacerd. c. xi. ap. Migne, Patr. lat. tom. civ. col. 138*).

Bishop Chrodogang of Metz, in the year 765, assembled the clergy of his cathedral around him, led a community life with them, and gave them a rule taken from the statutes of ancient orders and canons, the object of which was the elevation of the priesthood in morality and knowledge.

From this time this quasi-monastic life ("vita canonica sive communis"), which had already been introduced by some bishops before the time of Chrodogang, found imitators and admirers, among whom was Charlemagne, who expressed the wish that "all the clergy should be either monks or canons."

The clergy of other churches also united in a community life. It was this that gave rise to the cathedral or collegiate chapters. The cathedral chapters filled a very important office as regards the administration of dioceses. They formed the senate of the bishop, and were endowed with special rights and privileges.

But community life being incompatible with the possession of private property in the hands of individual canons and of the appointment of canons as potentiaries of the bishop, the former simplicity and strictness of rule ceased when, owing to the great wealth of some of the members, relaxation ensued. This brought about the dissolution of these associations, and the ancient mode of canonical life was given up. The property of the chapters was then divided up into prebends, and each canon received a dwelling-house for himself. The members of such chapters as these were termed "canonici saeculares;" those who retained the ancient mode of life were "canonici regulares."

The attempts made in the eleventh century by the reform-synods to restore the ancient "vita communis" did not meet with the success hoped for. According to the ancient ecclesiastical rule, the episcopal church of a city was also the parish church, and it was not till the eleventh century that other parishes were founded near this one. In the country rural chapters were formed, over which archpriests or deans presided, in order to establish a close connection among the rural clergy. The class of ecclesiastics known as *chorepiscopi*, or rural bishops,¹ disappeared in the West during the course of the tenth century. They were replaced by bishops-vicar ("episcopi in partibus," "episcopi titulares," "annulares," etc.).

In order to facilitate the administration of their dioceses, several bishops, following the example of Bishop Heddo of Strasburg in 774, divided their sees into several archdeaconries, presided over by

¹ See § 19.

an equal number of archdeacons. During the ninth century a sort of judicial synod was introduced, the seven sworn members of which had to report all the important transactions of Christian life in the congregations allotted them to visit, either to the bishop or to the archdeacon.

According to canonical rule, the bishops were to hold synods at certain times. The migration of nations and the relaxation of the metropolitan connection often made it difficult to bring these assemblies together, or even rendered it impossible to do so. St. Boniface, however, succeeded in re-establishing the metropolitan annexus, and the provincial synods which were connected with it; but, unfortunately, in the tenth century these again fell into disuse. Since the eleventh century the bishops of the seven suburban bishoprics, the rectors of the twenty-eight parish churches, and the eighteen deacons of Rome have obtained the honorable title of Cardinal, and several rights,—among them, that of electing the Pope.

§ 94. *Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals.*

The Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals,¹ a collection of canons the compiler of which calls himself Isidore mercator, consists of the genuine articles of the collection ascribed to St. Isidore of Seville, to which the Pseudo-Isidore has added yet other canons, decrees, etc., not attributable to the saint.

This collection, which came into circulation in the Frankish Empire during the ninth century, is divided into three parts, and contains, beside some introductory articles: (1) The fifty Apostolic Canons of Dionysius Exiguus; sixty letters and decrees pretending to be from Popes of Rome, from Clement to Melchiades (+ 314); and the so-called Deed of Gift falsely ascribed to Constantine the Great. (2) Decrees of councils which are taken from the genuine Spanish collection. (3) Decrees of the Popes Sylvester I. (+ 335) to Gregory II. (+ 731); among these thirty-five are counterfeit; to which were added several fictitious councils.²

¹ Ed. Merlin, Collect. conc. tom. i. Paris, 1523, printed in *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. lxxx., after the Cologne edition of 1530. Newest edition *Paul Hinschius*, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidoriana et capitula Angilramni*. The rich literature on the Pseudo-Isidore is given by *Walter*, Manual of C. L. (14th ed.), p. 202, and *Phillips*, Manual of C. L., p. 48.

² Also “mercatus;” in some codices it is written “peccator.”

³ They extend to the Thirteenth Council of Toledo.

But these non-genuine articles of the Pseudo-Isidore are by no means pure inventions: they are (1) partly real canons and decrees of later Popes and synods erroneously ascribed to earlier Popes and councils; (2) partly also are they apocryphal articles, which had, however, found reception in private collections and been previously known; and partly are they (3) decrees which in regard to form were inventions, but the contents of which were derived from genuine sources.¹

The several Decretals, which, in fact, contain nothing new in themselves, expatiate on subjects of faith, and confute the heresies of Arianism, Nestorianism, etc.; they impart moral instruction and give admonitions to both clergy and laity, afford particular information in regard to ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies, and treat of many questions of ecclesiastical rights, particularly of the primacy, of the relative position that bishops bear to the metropolitan and to the temporal power, the inviolability of Church property, etc.

The author, Pseudo-Isidore, gives as the object of his work his wish to bring together in one volume the whole ecclesiastical discipline for clergy and for laity; and the contents accord with this view.²

There is no positive certainty as to the real author of the collection. Probabilities are in favor of Benedict Levita of Mayence. It is neither of Italian (Roman) nor of Spanish origin, but is West Frankish, as the collection dates from thence in the years 835-857.

These Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals did not effect any essential change in ecclesiastical discipline: (1) Because for the most part they only represent the principles of the age in which they were written, principles which were already rooted in the ancient laws; (2) Because the few new principles³ introduced were not practically carried out; (3) Because they were chiefly promulgated only in the Western Empire of the Franks.

¹ The material for the spurious acts was taken by Pseudo-Isidore from the Fathers of the Church, from ecclesiastical writers, from the *Liber pontificalis*, the Church histories of *Rufin* (§ 55), and *Cassiodor*'s authentic Canons and Decrees, etc. (§ 77).

² Cf. Praef. *Compellor a multis tam episcopis quam reliquis servis Dei canonum sententias colligere et in uno volumine redigere et de multis unum facere . . . quatenus ecclesiastici ordinis disciplina in unam a nobis coacta atque digesta et sancti praesules paternis instituantur regulis, obedientes ecclesiae ministri vel populi spiritualibus imbuantur exemplis et non malorum hominum pravitatibus decipiuntur, etc.*

³ To which belongs, for example, the proposition that provisional synods may not be called together without the consent of the Pope, and must submit their conclusions to papal approval.

The assertion that Pope Nicholas I. appealed to them on his own behalf is false. In the Roman Church they were not particularly recognized before the eleventh century. The authenticity of some of these *Decretals* was called in question as early as the fifteenth century.¹ In the sixteenth century learned men proved that the most ancient of these pretended papal decrees were not genuine, and the learned brothers Ballerini have placed beyond doubt the fact that many other articles were spurious, which till their time had been held to be authentic.

§ 95. *The Primacy.—Power and Influence of the Popes.*

All the historians of this epoch acknowledge, in the most unmistakable terms, the primacy of the Roman See, which they deduce from the fact that the Church in Rome derives its authority in a direct line from St. Peter.²

The supreme power of the Popes, and the recognition of that supremacy by synods, bishops, and temporal rulers, become still more apparent in the action of the Apostolic See, which brought its influence to bear, as a right intrusted to it by God, on the well-being of the Church and of humanity at large, without being on that account accused of undue arrogance.

In order to understand better in what this universal action of the Popes consisted, it will suffice to bring the following facts under notice: As supreme head of the Church, the duty of the bishop of Rome involved the charge of spreading her faith, of protecting her rights, and of defending the purity of her doctrine; the Popes of this epoch complied with this duty by authorizing and giving their support to missionaries,³ by resisting the encroachments of assuming temporal rulers,⁴ by rejecting the heresies of the time, and by excommunicating their originators or defenders.⁵

A still wider extension of the primatical power is seen in the right of the Popes to erect new dioceses and to divide existing bishoprics. The personal exercise of this right by the Pope became the more necessary where abuses and disorders had crept into the

¹ By Nicholas of Cusa (+ 1464) and John of Turrecremata (+ 1468).

² See § 52. A Capitulary of Charlemagne says: *Sic omnes Apostolicae sedis sanctiones accipienda sunt, tanquam divina Petri voce firmatae sint.*

³ See § 79 sqq.

⁴ Compare Church and State.

⁵ See § 100 sqq.

Church, whereas formerly the erection or division of a bishopric could take place through the metropolitan or the provincial synod.

It also became frequently necessary for the Popes to decide in cases of resignation, removal, and deposition of bishops; which matters had formerly come under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan.¹

The erection of new metropoles and the conferring of metropolitan rights in the West also was a privilege peculiar to the Bishop of Rome, whom after the eighth century the metropolitans petitioned for the pallium, and with it for the confirmation of their election.

Also at this epoch, as in former times, bishops who had been condemned by their metropolitan or by provincial synods appealed to the Pope, who confirmed, changed, or rejected the sentence pronounced. Even simple priests, when forced by circumstances to do so, appealed to Rome.

Of this right Nicholas I. made use against the Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims when Rothad, Bishop of Soissons, who had been deposed by Hincmar, and when Ebbo, formerly Archbishop of Rheims, appealed to him. In like manner Nicholas successfully defended the rights of the papal throne against John, Archbishop of Ravenna, who oppressed his clergy and people, encroached upon the possessions of the Roman Church, and on whom the admonitions of the Apostolic See fell unheeded.

In the case of Arnulph, Archbishop of Rheims, who on the charge of high-treason against Hugh Capet had in 991 been compelled by a synod to resign his position, and to relinquish his see to the learned Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester, Pope John XV. used his supreme power over the Church, and in 995 compelled Gerbert to abdicate the archbishopric.

Another right, also founded on the primacy, and which had been already exercised by the earlier Popes, was that of appointing Vicars Apostolic, and of sending *Legates a latere*, who facilitated business negotiations and rendered a closer investigation of controverted questions possible.

Finally, the Popes repeatedly defended the sanctity of the marriage tie, against licentious princes. Such was the case when Lothaire, King of Lorraine, repudiated his lawful wife Theutberga, and married Waldrada. Two synods at Aix-la-Chapelle, under the presidency

¹ The bishops of the Synod of Troyes (867) prayed Nicholas I. to take care that no bishop should be deposed without the Pope's consent.

of Archbishop Gunther of Cologne and Thietgaud of Treves, had declared the marriage of Lothaire with Theutberga invalid. Theutberga appealed to Nicholas I.; but the papal legates, bribed by Lothaire, at the assembly of Lotharingian bishops at Metz in 863, combined with them to confirm the previous decision. Whereupon the Pope, being informed of these proceedings, suspended the legates and the members of the synod, and cited the affair before his own tribunal; where, having carefully investigated the facts, he at a Roman synod annulled the sentence of the Synod of Metz.

The occupation of Rome by the army of Lothaire's brother could not intimidate the great Pope. Lothaire was compelled to receive his wife again. But as he did not give up intercourse with Waldrada, and as he ill-treated Theutberga, the latter entreated Nicholas to dissolve the marriage, which he refused to do. Under Adrian II., Lothaire renewed the attempt to obtain a divorce, but to no purpose; he died on his return home, at Piacenza (869). Then Hincmar wrote "De divortii Lotharii regis."¹

§ 96. *Meritorious Influence of the Apostolic See on Ecclesiastical Discipline.—Religious Affairs in Various Countries in Europe.*

The Apostolic See acquired a high degree of renown for the unremitting perseverance, crowned with glorious success, with which the Popes applied themselves to the restoration of Church discipline. Various causes, chiefly the undue intervention of the secular power in the sphere of the Church,² had introduced within her portals many unworthy ministers, who had neither entered therein by the right gate, nor, having entered, had led a life in accordance with the precepts of the Church.

The two fundamental evils, simony and concubinage, called forth complaints on all sides, and in most countries of Christendom attempts at reaction were made; but it required the combined efforts of the Apostolic See, of able bishops, of eminent priests and monks, to remove these abuses.

As long as the Church of St. Peter was oppressed, and groaning under the yoke of the political factions of the nobility, the Popes were not able to display any great energy for the promotion of a better observance of the ecclesiastical laws in the various countries surrounding the Holy See; but so much the more zealous were sev-

¹ Ap. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxxv. col. 623 sqq.

² See § 91.

eral prominent bishops in their earnest exertions to place a check on the prevalent depravity of morals.

A great reformer in England,¹ where corruption had first entered and diffused itself with the rule of the Danes since 836, was St. Dunstan, Abbot of Glastonbury, and at a later date Archbishop of Canterbury, who combated vice and immorality with the same vigor whether he met it on the throne or among the clergy and people. Being sustained by the two bishops, Oswald of Worcester and Ethelwald of Winchester, and encouraged by King Edgar, the energetic archbishop held several synods,² at which the observance of the laws of the Church was strictly enjoined, renitent clergymen inexorably punished, monasteries reformed,³ and the relaxed discipline replaced under canonical rule. Under him the Church in England received a new elevation, a fresh impulse; yet at the death of Dunstan in 988, it again declined in religious fervor. Under the reign of King Edward the Confessor (1042-1066), matters at first seemed to improve, but they did not advance so far as to obtain a complete victory over tepidity and relaxation of rule.⁴

The Church in Ireland, which in the seventh and eighth centuries was, like that in England, enjoying a prosperous and flourishing condition, declined in 795 from the self-same causes which had occasioned the decline in England, namely, from the ravages and devastations of the Danes and Normans, who carried desolation with them wherever they landed, who pulled down churches and destroyed many of the most flourishing institutions of learning. Irish priests and monks sought an asylum in England or on the Continent; the in-born inclination for roving added to the number of the emigrants. Others, although released by the king from the obligation of enter-

¹ *Lingard*, Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, p. 240.

² *Wilkins*, *Concilia magnae Brit. et Hibern.* Lond. 1737. *Harduin*, vi. l. c. 657 sqq. Archbishop Odo of Canterbury and King Edmund (944) enacted laws against incontinent clergymen. Cf. *Harduin*, l. c. c. 589 sqq.

³ Dunstan built Westminster Abbey at his own cost, and recalled the monks who had been driven away by King Edwin from Glastonbury and Abingdon. The former Chancellor of State, Turkethl, restored the Abbey of Croyland, and became the abbot. Under King Edgar the ruined abbeys of Ely, Peterborough, Thorney, and Malmesbury were rebuilt, and fifty abbeys erected in all.

⁴ Edward appointed the Norman Robert Archbishop of Canterbury, who in 1053 had to yield to the ignorant and artful Stigand. This man still retained his former bishopric of Winchester. Aldred, Archbishop of York and Bishop of Worcester, also led a very scandalous life. They were both suspended by Nicholas II. and Alexander II.

ing the army, were carried away by the universal spirit of warfare and love of feuds; among these were even bishops and abbots.

A great number of Irish monks were scattered in the various monasteries of the Continent, particularly in Germany. But in many places they possessed monasteries of their own, which had been erected partly out of gratitude for the services of Irish missionaries, partly as pilgrim hospitals for Irish travellers to Rome, partly also as schools of learning. Among these we may mention the monasteries of St. Symphorian at Metz, of St. Vannes at Verdun, of St. Martin at Cologne since 975, the cloister at Erfurt, and of St. James at Ratisbon.

By degrees the Danes who had settled in Ireland became converted, and in 1040 received their first bishop in Donatus, who took his see in Dublin. The royal and episcopal dignity were frequently united in one person. The Metropolitan See of Armagh, which extended its authority over the whole of Ireland, passed in the year 927 into the hands of a powerful family, whose posterity held it for upwards of two hundred years, in such a manner that even some of the married members arrogated to themselves the title and rights of an archbishop without having received ordination, delegating, however, the performance of their spiritual functions to other bishops.

A great part of Scotland belonged to Northumbria, and in ecclesiastical matters to the metropolis of York. The monastery of St. Thomas on the island of Hy long continued to be the nursery of missionary priests. The clergy were nearly all of them monks or men leading a life according to the regular rule of canons in community (Culdees, Keldeer). The Bishop of Dunkeld, the church of which was founded in 849 by King Kenneth, conqueror of the Picts, enjoyed a primacy over the Scottish churches, which towards the end of the ninth century passed to the Bishop of St. Andrews.

The civil wars in the Frankish kingdom had naturally given rise to much disorder, and had been the occasion of much ignorance and immorality even among the clergy. It was in vain that several synods and several of the most celebrated divines from the congregation of Clugny¹ exerted their utmost efforts to uproot the evil. They succeeded only in planting the germ of better things. The newly flourishing schools of the tenth and eleventh centuries gave rise to bright hopes regarding the scientific and moral regeneration of clergy and laity.²

¹ *Lorrain*, History of the Abbey of Clugny.

² See § 97.

In Spain, which for the most part was under Saracen rule, the state of morality was far better.

In Germany there lived many bishops distinguished alike for sanctity and learning; as Bruno of Cologne (+ 965), Bardo of Mentz (+ 1051), Henry of Treves (+ 964), Burchard of Worms, Ulrich of Augsburg, and others, who at various synods¹ passed severe laws, and were powerfully upheld by the Saxon emperors.² The efforts of the inmates of the German monasteries were no less successful in the effects they produced for the regeneration of the clergy of the Christian people and of the Catholic Church generally.³

The salutary reaction having begun in this manner, the gigantic combat opened in the eleventh century, which after lasting a long time terminated in the victory of the cause of God.⁴ At the head of the combatants stood the Popes, who during the interval had recovered their exterior freedom and independence.

No sooner had Clement II. ascended the throne of St. Peter than he pronounced sentence of excommunication on those who were guilty of simony or of concubinage, and threatened those who *knowingly* received orders from a simoniacal bishop with a forty days' ecclesiastical penance. It is to be regretted that this Pope and his successor, Damasus II., reigned so short a time that they could not carry out their reforms in every direction.

The pious and zealous Pope Leo IX. renewed, in the Roman Synod in 1049, the ordinances of his predecessors, and proceeded with great severity against immoral clergymen whose lives had been depicted to him, by Peter Damian, perhaps in colors too glaring, in descriptions too vivid, too much overdrawn.

In order to give greater force to his ordinances, the indefatigable Pope, while punishing severely those whose transgressions of the

¹ Under King Arnulph, the great synod at Tribur, 895, was held for the re-establishment of Church discipline.

² Diethmar of Merseburg (Chron. ii. 8) says of the time of Ortho I. : *Temporibus suis illuxit aureum saeculum.*

³ See §§ 97, 98, 99. The monasteries were, in the proper sense of the word, the nurseries of knowledge and piety.

⁴ On the condition of the public at large, see *Bruno Sign. Vita Leon. IX.* : *Mundus totus in maligno positus est, defecerat sanctitas, justitia perierat et veritas sepulta erat; regnabit iniquitas, avaritia dominabitur, Simon magus ecclesiam possidebat, episcopi et sacerdotes voluptibus et fornicationi dediti erant. Non erubescabant sacerdotes uxores ducere, palam uuptias faciebant . . . vix aliquis inveniebatur, qui vel simoniacus non esset, vel a simoniaciis ordinatus non fuisset.* (Watterich, *Vitae Rom. Pontif. i.* 96.)

ecclesiastical law were publicly known, pursued a milder course with those whose transgressions were of a more venial kind. He held synods in upper Italy (Pavia), France (Rheims), Germany (Mentz), and in lower Italy (Salerno), in which, as also in the Council of Coyaca in Spain, laws were enacted not only against simony and concubinage, but also against incestuous marriages, adultery, perjury, sacrilegious robbery of churches, etc.; and for the improvement of religious life many excellent precepts were given.

The struggle continued under Victor II. The synods of Florence (1055) under the presidency of the Pope, of Compostella in Spain (1056), and those of Lyons (1055), of Tours (1055), of Toulouse (1056), which were presided over by Hildebrand, the papal legate,—these all repeated the reformatory decrees, the execution of which was strictly commanded.

The same thing took place during the short pontificate of Stephen IX., and under Nicholas II., who in the Roman Synod, 1059, prohibited every kind of simony, forbade those priests who were living in concubinage from exercising their functions, and enjoined the faithful not to assist at the Mass of such priests.

The legates of the Apostolic See labored with unceasing zeal for the execution of these mandates. Peter Damian held several synods in Italy with this express view, and Cardinal Stephen travelled through France, where he held the reformatory synods of Vienne and Tours for the same object, while Abbot Hugh of Clugny held reformatory synods at Avignon and Toulouse.

These ecclesiastical ordinances were also published in Germany, but there they could not check the moral corruption which broke forth and spread itself around under the reign of Henry IV. The situation was best in Spain, where the laws of the Church were respected more and more; and it was better even in England, where the energetic monarch, William the Conqueror, albeit with some danger to the liberty of the Church, replaced the degenerate clergy with Norman ecclesiastics, and upheld with a strong hand the carrying into effect of the canons and decrees of ecclesiastical discipline.

Resistance to the execution of these decrees was by no means wanting. Alexander II. encountered great opposition when he attempted to promulgate these decrees. In upper Italy, chiefly at Milan, the "Pataria," a reformatory party headed by two priests, Ariald and Landulph, combated the simoniacal and incontinent clergy, who were protected by Guido, the weak Archbishop of Milan, and who went so far as to excommunicate Ariald in 1057.

The sentence of the archbishop was reversed by the Pope. The Pataria, which after the death of Landulph was under the leadership of his brother Herlembald, extended its influence and increased the number of its members till it spread over the whole of Lombardy, and its efforts were faithfully seconded by the monks of Camaldoli and of Vallombrosa, with whose help the work went successfully forward.

On the other hand, the simoniacal and Nicolaite heretical party waged a warfare with lies and calumnies against the papal legates Hildebrand, Peter Damian, etc. They removed their powerful assailant, Ariald, by assassination, feeling themselves protected by the licentious king, Henry IV., under whose guardianship Archbishop Guido of Milan forgot his promise to do penance and pursue a better line of conduct, and at last sold his archbishopric to Godfrey, a rich clergyman.

Then again bloody scenes were witnessed in the city of St. Ambrose, until finally the Pataria succumbed. But the good cause did not succumb with them; for just at that precise time God called to the supreme government of his Church a man who for long years past had displayed a self-sacrificing activity in behalf of the welfare of that Church, and now, raised to the chair of Peter, was to complete the work he had begun as a monk and continued as a cardinal. This man was Hildebrand,—Pope Gregory VII.

§ 97. *The Order of St. Benedict.*

In the West there were many monastic associations in the fourth and fifth centuries. But the chief originator of monastic life in this Western world is St. Benedict of Nursia (480-543), who at a time of profligacy and confusion which involved the decay of morality, laid the foundation of that world-wide celebrated order from which the spiritual regeneration of mankind was to proceed.

After Benedict had spent three years in a dark and fearful narrow grotto near Subiaco, he, at the urgent request of the monks, assumed the direction of the monastery of Vicovaro; but the degenerated monks so harassed him that he again retired to his former solitude, where, at the request of his disciples, he founded twelve cloisters, which he governed himself, until the intrigues of a bad priest induced him to leave Subiaco and to build on Monte Casino the world-renowned abbey which was to become the mother cloister for the whole order.

It was here that he wrote the Rule of his order, consisting of seventy-three chapters, which became the fundamental principles on which to found all later rules. This Rule, which may aptly be termed the "Synopsis of Christian Doctrine," especially insists on obedience and renunciation of all personal or other property on the part of the monks, whose daily occupations were to be prayer, manual labor, and in the course of time the pursuit of knowledge. The abbot was placed at the head of the association. In very important affairs he was to consult with the whole chapter; in less important cases, with those monks who were of highest repute. The prior ranked next to the abbot; to every ten monks a dean was appointed.

There was this difference between their Rule and that of other monks in that article (chapter fifty-eight of the Rule) which demands the promise of residence ("stabilitas loci"). Reception into the order was preceded by a novitiate. The dress and food of the brethren, whether they gave themselves to the cloister as oblates or entered the order as converts to God ("conversi"), was very simple. The duty of hospitality was particularly enjoined on them. Every abbey was to possess everything necessary to the sustenance of the inmates,—namely, gardens, a mill, workshops of several kinds, etc. Most of the monks continued to be laymen; there were very few priests in the cloisters, but the services of the choir were conducted with great solemnity. Any infraction of the Rule was visited with severe penalties, sometimes even with corporal punishment.

The order of St. Benedict, into which persons of the highest rank entered, spread very rapidly. St. Placidus introduced the Rule of St. Benedict into Sicily; St. Maurus, into Gaul. In the sixth century it was very generally received in Spain. In England it was established by the Abbot St. Augustine.¹ There were cloisters in Germany before the arrival of St. Boniface, the inmates of which followed the Benedictine Rule. The Scandinavians also received the first cloisters at the same time that the true faith was announced to them.

Wherever the Benedictine monks settled themselves they brought with them a high degree of culture and of civilization; for as the work of their hands changed the dreary desert into a fruitful soil, so the endeavors of their minds effected a change in the aspirations of the people, and taught them to look for a higher, a better life.

¹ See § 79.

The most self-sacrificing missionaries, the ablest bishops, belonged to this order, which also ranked artists and learned men among its members, and gave many excellent Popes to the Church.

How greatly the faithful appreciated these merits is seen alike by the vast donations as by the extensive privileges which in the course of time were bestowed on these abbeys, both by temporal and ecclesiastical superiors.

It was not so much the wealth or the exemptions, nor even the destructive feuds in the ninth and tenth centuries, that brought about relaxation in monastic discipline. This was owing principally to the encroachments of the temporal power and to the interference of several bishops; chiefly, however, to the appointment of lay abbots, who brought alike spiritual and material ruin to the monasteries. A state so unsuitable as this to the religious life could only find a remedy in the renewed observance of monastic rule in all its fervor; and this was the aim of all the attempts at reform which were made from time to time.

Benedict of Aniane, on whom Louis the Mild and the bishops and abbots assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle (817) imposed the supreme direction of all the Benedictine monasteries in the kingdom of the Franks, was a worthy reformer of this description.

Of exceptional importance in fostering the spirit of clostral life, was the congregation of Clugny, founded by William, Duke of Aquitaine, in 909, which extended its spiritual influence far beyond its walls. In Germany, the monastery of Hirsau, remodelled after that of Clugny, by Abbot William the Blest (1071-1091), proved of essential benefit. In Italy the cloister of Camaldoli, founded by St. Romuald (1018), and that of Vallombrosa, in Tuscany, founded by St. John Gualbert (1038), reacted in a salutary and efficient manner on the mother cloister itself.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. SCHOOLS OF LEARNING.

§ 98. *State of Knowledge before Charlemagne.*

ALTHOUGH the devastations occasioned by the migration of nations had been very prejudicial to the culture of knowledge, yet the Church had not neglected to bestow on the Germanic nations such a culture as the development of their faculties and the corresponding spiritual attainments enabled them to receive. The spiritual

impulse came from Italy, nay, from Rome itself, where most of the remnants of ancient classical literature had been preserved, which henceforth were to serve as models for succeeding ages.

Among the learned men of Italy who had attained to great fame, were Dionysius Exiguus, Boethius, and Cassiodorus. But greater yet was St. Gregory the Great, born at Rome in 540, who adorned the apostolic chair from 590 to 604. Though a member of a wealthy family, he, following the call of God, exchanged his costly vesture for the habit of St. Benedict, and relinquished his palace for a cloister, in which he lived with some monks until Pope Pelagius sent him as Apocrisiarius to Constantinople,—a position he occupied for six years, after which he became abbot of his monastery, from which the voice of the clergy and of the people alike called him forth to occupy the seat of Peter.

As Pope he was incessantly active in promoting the conversion of the heathen and the welfare of the oppressed people of Italy. He labored for the strict observance of the laws of the Church, for the celebration of religious services in a worthy manner; and notwithstanding the delicacy of his health and his manifold occupations, he found time to conduct personally the instruction in choral chant, of which he is the author, and to leave to posterity valuable writings in which the classic culture, the profoundly religious sensitiveness, the learning, and the practical sense of their author is beautifully depicted. The principal work of Gregory is his "Expositio in Job," or "Libri 35 Moralium," a moral theology.

In Spain learning flourished under King Recared, but declined under subsequent monarchs. Among the most eminent men were the bishops Leander (+ 596), and his brother Isidore of Seville (+ 636), Ildefonse (+ 667), and Julian of Toledo (+ 690), the theologian and poet Eugene of Toledo (+ 657), and others, whose works treat of exegetical or explanatory, moral, and historical subjects, and also of questions of canon law.

On the British islands the monastery of Bangor in Wales was the most ancient and principal seat of learning until the conflicts with the Danes and Saxons endangered its very existence. Learning had then to wait for that conversion of the Anglo-Saxons which would make it possible to found monasteries, in which knowledge and a religious life should combine their advantages. The Briton Gildas, who lived about the middle of the sixth century, has left very important works on the history of those times. We have already spoken of the celebrated teachers, Theodore of Canterbury,

Adrian, and Bennet Biscop. The Venerable Bede, a monk of Yarrow (+ 735), takes an honorable position by the side of these as a learned and diligent author, to whom, besides other works, we are indebted for a history of the conversion of England. Egbert, Archbishop of York, tutor or one of the tutors of the celebrated Alcuin, was a disciple of the Venerable Bede.

In Gaul, of which the Franks were gradually becoming masters, there existed, besides the cloister schools of Lerins and Tours, several other institutions of learning, which, however, suffered greatly from the disorders of the times.

Gregory, Bishop of Tours (+ 594), the historian of the Frankish Empire, makes a great lamentation over the decline of learning. His History was continued by Fredegar up to 641. The unknown author of the "Gesta regum Francorum" made another continuation, which reached to the time of Theodoric IV. (+ 637). St. Boniface laid the first germ of a new scientific development in the Frankish kingdom.

The characteristic of the above-named writers is rather that of putting to good use and preserving what was valuable in antecedent Christian literature than that of originating any new production.

§ 99. *Learning under Charlemagne and his Successors.*

St. Boniface gave a very powerful impetus to knowledge when he sought to communicate the intellectual acquisitions of England to Germany.

His work was continued by Charlemagne, who in unison with the bishops insisted in several capitularies on the cultivation of knowledge, first by the clergy and then by the laity; to effect which he, by inviting to his court learned men, made a provision for the development of able teachers, and in the school of his court — Schola Palatina, of which it was said that it flourished so much it might well be termed a seminary of every good art — he called into life a model institution, which might well serve for a pattern to the remaining cathedral and cloister schools.

Among the learned men who exercised a definite influence on the direction of studies, were Peter of Pisa, Paul (Warnefried) Diaconus, and Paulinus of Aquileia; but the most renowned was Alcuin (Alhwin), born at York in 735, and head master of the school at York, who in 782 undertook the direction of the Schola Palatina, or school at the court of Charlemagne; and at a later

period, when he became abbot, founded a similar institution at St. Martin's of Tours, at which he labored till his death (+ 803). Alcuin was beyond all doubt the most celebrated teacher of his day; his schools were prolific nurseries whence came forth the rectors of other institutions of this kind.

Charlemagne directed his attention also to ecclesiastical chant, and for this purpose founded the schools of Metz and Soissons, to which he appointed singing-teachers, for whom he sent to Italy. The education of youth, which this great emperor also took greatly to heart, was cared for by Bishop Theodulph of Orleans (+ 821), who provided for their instruction by the establishment of elementary schools. In this manner Charlemagne added, to the undying fame he had acquired as an able general and gifted statesman, the yet more important merit of having done his part in the promotion of that true civilization and enlightenment which is based upon religion.

The political position of the kingdom under Louis the Mild was unfavorable to the diffusion of knowledge, which, however, enjoyed the protection of the emperor, who had himself received a learned education, and was also patronized by his son Charles the Bald. After the death of the latter, whose court had been a meeting-place for the learned of every land, knowledge became chiefly protected by the spiritual superiors of the realm, who furnished ample means of support to the cathedral and cloistral schools.

The zeal with which ecclesiastical superiors labored for the true enlightenment of the human race is apparent from the fact that nearly all the cathedrals and monasteries had learned schools attached to them, whence in course of time came forth scholars who attained a great renown.

In these cathedral and cloistral schools the theological and philosophical sciences¹ were taught; and not these alone, but jurisprudence and medicine were also studied. To which it may be added that the ancient Roman literature exercised a dominant influence on the development of the mediæval scholar. The Greek language, while not utterly neglected, was less cultivated. A literature in the mother tongue could only be formed by slow degrees.

The teachers in the said schools were themselves men educated in all the knowledge of the age, and were besides enabled by their birth and previous social position to instruct their students thor-

¹ The seven liberal arts: the so-called Trivium (Grammar, Rhetoric, and Physics), and the Quadrivium (Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, and Astronomy). This is not the division made by Alcuin, who distinguishes Ethics, Physics, and Theology.

oughly, while they enlarged the intellectual horizon and exercised a stimulating influence over them in every respect. The students were divided into boarders and outsiders ("interni et externi"). Instruction was given gratuitously.

To facilitate and promote study, numerous and often valuable libraries were in use;¹ these were of themselves testimonies of the zeal for knowledge and of the spirit of self-sacrifice which animated the clergy, since they were formed not infrequently of copies of manuscripts made by themselves.

Another name shines brightly by the side of that of Alcuin; it is that of St. Rabanus Maurus, his pupil, who was born at Mentz in 785. He was distinguished for his many-sided learning, and his singular talent for imparting knowledge; he became Abbot of Fulda in 822, and in 847-856 was archbishop in his native city. In the great cloister-school at Fulda, a large number of assiduous young men pursued their studies under his guidance, who afterwards became teachers at other institutions. One of the most remarkable disciples of Rabanus is Walafried Strabo, Abbot of Reichenau (+ 849), who, besides his "Glossa ordinaria," composed several other works in prose and verse. No less influential was the cloister school of St. Gall, where piety kept equal pace with knowledge.

The most eminent teachers there were Notker Balbulus, famed alike as a poet and a scholar, with his friends Rapert and Tutilo. Einhard, Abbot of Seligenstadt (Mühlenheim), left us an excellent biography of Charlemagne and other historical writings. Haymo, at first a Benedictine monk and teacher at Fulda, but subsequently (840) Bishop of Halberstadt, has left us a Church history and several commentaries on Holy Writ.

The most important work written in German poetry is the Gospel epic "Heliand" (Heiland, or Savior), based on the Scriptural narrative, which appeared in the reign of Louis the Mild. Similar to this, but inferior in depth of conception, is the poetical paraphrase of the Gospels called "Christ," written by Otfried, a monk of the monastery of Weissenburg in Alsace (+ 870). He was a pupil of Rabanus.

Among the literary men of France, the following are deserving of special mention: Halitgar, Bishop of Cambrai (+ 831); the learned monks Paschasius Radbertus, and Ratramnus from the monastery of Old Corvey; Claudius, Bishop of Turin (+ 839); Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons (+ 840), the zealous opponent of slavery, of ordeals, and of superstitious practices, but also, like Claudius of Turin, an oppo-

¹ *Mabillon*, l. c. ii. 152 sqq. *Ziegelbauer*, l. c. p. 453.

ment of images ; Ansegisus, Abbot of Fontenelle (+ 833), who collected the capitularies of Charlemagne ; Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims (+ 882), an excellent canonist and dogmatic scholar, who sometimes suffered himself to be carried away by the vehemence of his temper.

But the incomprehensible John Scotus Erigena attracted greater attention than all these. Little is known of his personal history ; undoubtedly he possessed speculative talents, was probably by birth an Irishman, who lived at the court of Charles the Bald, took part in all the conflicting questions agitated by the learned of his age, and by his translation of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita exerted a great influence on the mysticism of the Middle Ages. In several of his writings he reproduces the ideal-pantheistic of the Neoplatonists.

Even though the tenth century was not specially favorable to the cultivation of the Muses, it by no means deserves the epithet of the "dark" or "iron" century ; on the contrary, under the reign of the Othos in Germany, knowledge was carefully pursued by the clergy, and the many saintly bishops of that era eagerly promoted scientific pursuits, and encouraged others to do so.

The old cloistral schools fully maintained their ancient reputation, while rivals arose to share in their honorable renown ; among these we may specify the school of Hirsau, which under Meginrad enjoyed a great repute for learning. The cloister school of St. Gall numbered among its teachers, Eccehard I. (+ 973) and his nephew Eccehard II., — the latter was also the tutor of Otho II., and he finally became provost of the cathedral of Mentz, and rector of the school at that place (+ 990) ; Notker, the physician (+ 1008), also a nephew of Eccehard I. ; and Notker Labeo (+ 1022), a distinguished theologian and philosopher, who was not less versed in philology, music, and poetry, which were also taught in St. Gall.

Fulda and Reichenau also had able teachers, while a very lively zeal for knowledge animated Saxony. The historian Widukind (about 940) was a monk of Corvey. The History written by the Bishop Dithmar of Merseburg (+ 1019) was in high repute. The celebrated nun Roswitha (Hrotsuit), noted for her learned and classical culture, lived in the cloister of Gandersheim. At that time there were many women in Germany well versed in classical literature. Abbot Regino of Prüm, near Treves, and Bishop Burkhard of Worms, a pupil of the monastery of Laubes, made collections of canons.

In England, King Alfred the Great (+ 901), who had put an end to the Danish power in his country, did much for the restoration of learning, discipline, and good order. St. Dunstan was even more successful in these particulars ; it was from his monastery of Glastonbury that teachers came forth to minister to the instruction of England. Aelfried of Malmesbury (about 980) translated the Holy Scriptures into the Anglo-Saxon language.

In France the studies carried on at the Abbey of Clugny rivalled those of the schools of Tours and Rheims, with whom they contended for the precedence. Here Remigius of Auxerre taught with great applause, and gained great reputation by his explanations of Holy Scripture.

Another venerated teacher of the last-named school was Flooard of Rheims (+ 966). Under his successor, Gerbert, who had also visited the Moorish schools of Seville and Cordova, the school of Rheims reached the highest point of its renown. Among his pupils, Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres (+ 1028), shone forth alike in learning as in virtue. A numerously attended school flourished in Liege under the direction of the excellent Wazon, who afterwards became bishop of this city.

At this period it was Italy that presented the least favorable aspect in a literary point of view ; and this was mainly owing to the constant feuds between the nobles, whence in the tenth century the pursuit of knowledge was here greatly neglected, and literature became more pagan than Christian. Yet some acquired a name for learning at that time which posterity has hardly ratified ; among these were Bishop Luitprand of Cremona, a man of a worldly spirit and of loose morals, who was Chancellor to Otho I. ; also Atto, Bishop of Vercelli (+ 960), and Ratherius, Bishop of Verona (+ 974).

The eleventh century was the age of the restoration of science and discipline ; consequently learned studies were pursued with more success. Besides the cloister schools of Fulda and Hildesheim, Bishop Meinwerk (+ 1036) founded a school in Paderborn, which attained a high reputation. In Reichenau, under the Abbot Berno from the year 1008, there taught Herman of Reichenau, surnamed Contractus, the author of the "Salve Regina," and the "Alma redemptoris mater." He concealed in a feeble body a soul endowed with all the faculties which could confer pre-eminent wisdom and holiness. About the same time St. Gall had two distinguished scholars, Eccehard IV. (+ 1036) and Hepidanus (about 1072). In the monastery of St. Emmeran at Ratisbon, Othlo taught, who is also

renowned as a writer. Adam, a canon of Bremen (+ 1072), and Lambert, a monk at Hersfeld, composed historical works.

In France the monastic schools of Bec and Fecam gave the tone to the rest. Herein the most celebrated teacher was Lanfranc (+ 1089), a man of brilliant talent, who conferred an undying fame on the school of Bec, and afterwards labored with great success as Archbishop of Canterbury. St. Anselm, the founder of scholasticism, was trained by Lanfranc.

In Italy, Cardinal Humbert and Peter Damian, the Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, were distinguished for their great learning. Other writers of the Middle Ages will be mentioned in the history of the doctrinal controversies. The best edition of the various annals, chronicles, biographies of individuals who lived at this time, is that published by *Pertz*.¹

2. HERESIES AND SCHISMS.

§ 100. *Controversy respecting Images.*

This was the question as to the lawfulness of exposing for veneration images of Christ and of his saints in public places, in churches, and in private houses.²

The contest began in the East, under the Emperor Leo III. the Isaurian, who in the year 726 issued his first edict against images. What prompted this despotic ruler to this peremptory act — whether it was the example of the Caliph Jezid II., or the suggestions of the Bishop Constantin of Natolia and of the renegade Beser, or the accusations brought forward by Jews and Mahometans that Christians were idolaters, or whether he was wrought upon by the public calamities that broke over the empire — cannot now be definitely ascertained.

The edict of Leo which caused the destruction even of the famous image of Christ (ὁ Χριστός ἀντιφωνήτης) in the Chalcoprateia, was the occasion of revolts in many parts of the empire, especially in the Exarchate of Ravenna, where the people tore down the images of the emperor, and, but that they were withheld by Pope Gregory II., would have set up an anti-emperor. But neither the discontent of the people nor the representations of Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, nor the beautiful and energetic letters

¹ *Monumenta Germ. historica.* Hanoverae, 1826 sqq., 23 vols. fol.

² *Hefele*, History of the Councils. *Hergenröther*, Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, p. 226 sqq.

of the Pope,¹ nor the glorious treatises which St. John Damascene, the greatest theologian of his time, composed in justification of images, could move the emperor from his purpose.

Having defeated the insurgents in the East, Leo, who wanted to be “emperor and bishop” too, forced the pious Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, to yield his position to the more pliant Anastasius; and, to be revenged on Pope Gregory III., who in November, 731, had pronounced an anathema on all enemies of holy images, he confiscated the papal possessions in Calabria and Sicily, and forcibly wrested the Illyrian provinces from the Roman Patriarchate.

Under the government of the usurper Artabasdos, who had married Leo's daughter Anna, the strife concerning images came to an end; but when the son of Leo, Constantine V. (Copronymus), also termed Cabalinus (743-775), ascended the throne, it was renewed. The better to effect his object, he in the year 754 convoked the bishops of his kingdom to a so-called oecumenical council, in which the veneration of images was to be discussed. Three hundred and thirty-eight bishops met in assembly. Some of them were opposed to the use of images; some were too cowardly to oppose the cruel emperor. They therefore (especially since 761) decreed that the use of images should be forbidden, whereupon the destruction of pictures and images (iconoclasm) began in earnest. Those bishops who refused to obey the imperial edict were deposed; the defenders of the images, especially the monks, were cruelly misused and murdered; the costliest libraries and treasures of art were mercilessly demolished; pictorial representations of the life of Christ and of his saints, in the churches, were replaced by scenes of the chase, by landscapes and the like, or overlaid with lime (whitewashed); the sacred vessels were melted down, and the monasteries were either destroyed or turned into barracks. But neither these cruelties nor the oaths demanded by the unbelieving and licentious emperor could suppress the veneration paid to the sacred images. Pope Stephen III.² and the other three patriarchs³ of the East condemned the decisions of the pseudo-Synod of Constantinople, and anathematized the iconoclasts. The attempt of Constantine to gain over the Franks by embassies and presents failed.

¹ The Pope says, among other things, that we venerate the images only because they direct our minds towards heaven, *οὐ λατρευτικῶς ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς*; that we place our hope, not in the images, but on those represented by them.

² Stephen III. at the Lateran Synod of 769.

³ Cosmas of Alexandria, Theodore of Antioch, and Theodore of Jerusalem.

Leo IV. (Chazarus) upheld the iconoclastic laws of his father, but owing to the influence of his wife, Irene, conducted himself more mildly towards those who venerated images and pictures. Nevertheless, when some of his own courtiers were detected as advocates for images, the emperor threatened them with the severest punishments, in which assuredly those of the same opinion would have been involved if death had not set a term to Leo's wrath.

Irene, his widow, who held the reins of government during the minority of her son, Constantine VI., wished to restore the veneration of images; and, with this object in view, she applied not only to the Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople, but also to Pope Adrian I., and in conjunction with both of these convoked

THE SEVENTH OECUMENICAL SYNOD IN 787,

which was first held in Constantinople, and afterwards, when disturbances were occasioned by the soldiers, was transferred to Nice (Nicaenum II.). The Fathers of this council first affirmed the correct principles on which the veneration of images¹ is founded, then rejected the decree of the pseudo-Synod of Constantinople in 754. The decisions of the Nicaenum II. remained in force under Irene and under the two emperors, Nicephorus and Michael I. Leo V. the Armenian (813-820), whose principal counsellors were the lector John the Grammarian and Theodotus Cassiteras, a layman, again renewed the iconoclast struggle, and persecuted the favorers of images, especially the free-spoken abbot Theodore the Studite. The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople was deposed (815), and Theodotus Cassiteras nominated patriarch in his place. This prelate, in a so-called Synod of Constantinople, set at nought the decisions of the Seventh Oecumenical Council of Nice.

Leo's successor, Michael II. (Balbus) the Stammerer (820-829), at first declared neither for nor against the use of images; at a later date he joined the party of iconoclasts, and nominated the opposer of images, Anthony of Perge-Syläum, Patriarch of Constantinople.

The son of Michael, Theophilus, who made his tutor, John the Grammarian, patriarch of Constantinople, was also an iconoclast. His widow, Theodora, being of a directly opposite opinion to that

¹ *Actio 7.* The council decided that we may place the figure of the holy cross, pictures or images of Christ, of our "immaculate lady," of the angels and saints, in wood, stone, or other material, in our churches or anywhere else. Ancient custom sanctions the offering of incense and candles in veneration of images. The council also passed twenty-two canons.

of her husband, deposed John from his dignity, and named the confessor Methodius Patriarch of the Capital. Methodius convened a new synod in the year 842, which anathematized the iconoclasts, and reaffirmed the decisions of the Nicaenum II. On the first Sunday in Lent, Feb. 19, 842, solemn services were held in honor of the restoration of the decrees of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and of orthodoxy.

In consequence of a defective translation of the acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council sent to Charlemagne by Pope Adrian I., the image strife was also excited in the West. The so-called Caroline Books, composed by several theologians but principally by Alcuin, severely censured what they called the image-worshipping Council of Nice, while it blamed the iconoclasts of Constantinople (754); and this in a tone which revealed the bitter feelings of the Frankish court towards that of Byzantium. These books asserted the principle that images may be set up in order to ornament and adorn churches, and in commemoration of the saints they represent; but they are not to be venerated with the same reverence that we pay to the cross of Christ, to the sacred vessels, to reliques or garments of the saints: no incense is to be offered to them, no lights burned in their honor.

The line so sharply drawn at Nice between *λατρεία* and *προσκύνησις* is lost sight of, and only the translation of *προσκύνησις* by "adoratio" noticed. Under the same false supposition that the Council of Nice had allowed the honor of adoration, properly so called, to be paid to images, the bishops assembled at Frankfort in 794 against the Adoptionists, passed the same resolutions. Charlemagne sent an extract, or probably a revised edition, of the Caroline Books to Pope Adrian I., who sent back a refutation¹ on the subject, written in a mild and conciliatory tone.

The question of the veneration of images was again brought up at the Synod of Paris in 825. The impulse came from Constantinople, whence Michael II. had sent an embassy to Louis the Mild and Pope Eugene. The members of the synod likewise, misunderstanding the decrees of Nice, expressed themselves as did those of Frankfort (794), and contended against the iconoclasts, but likewise declared against image worship.

Very determined opponents of image worship in the West were found in the Spaniard Claudio, Bishop of Turin,—he even wished to remove the cross from the churches,—and in Agobard of Lyon.

¹ *Harduin*, iv. 744 sqq. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. xcviii. col. 1247 sqq.

They were opposed and refuted by many ecclesiastics, especially by the abbot Theodomir, by Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, by Dungal, an Irish monk of St. Denys, by Walafried Strabo, and Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, who skilfully defended the use and veneration of pictures and images.

§ 101. *The Greek Schism.*

The first seeds for the separation of the Greek Church from the Apostolic See¹ were sown by the third canon of the Council of Constantinople (381), and by the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon (451). The unfriendly sentiments thus called forth between Rome and Constantinople were increased by various circumstances, such as the difference of national character, of rite and discipline, and particularly through the despotism exercised by the State, and the ambition of many patriarchs of Constantinople, who found allies in the episcopate, which was entirely dependent on them, and in the haughty people. A hostile feeling towards Rome was already manifesting itself at the Second Trullan Synod,² in the year 692. The relative position of the Byzantine Court towards that of the Pope became still more unfriendly in view of the political changes in Italy, especially that of establishing the States of the Church, and the still greater stumbling-block occasioned by the restoration of the Western Empire, which was a great source of anxiety to the rulers of the East.

During the iconoclastic strife a marked aversion towards the Holy See became visible in many emperors and in the patriarchs of Constantinople. The formal separation, however, took place under the dissolute emperor, Michael III., a drunkard and buffoon, who left the government of his empire to his uncle, Bardas, an intriguer of ambitious and vicious character. Bardas hated the virtuous Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, against whom a faction headed by the Archbishop Gregory Asbestas of Syracuse also conspired, and made use of his position to get rid of this pious and courageous prelate. The plan succeeded. Ignatius was, in 857, banished by the emperor for high-treason.

Photius succeeded Ignatius, who sturdily resisted the demand that he should resign his dignity. Photius was a layman, but full of ambition and of very dubious character, yet he received consecration at the hands of Gregory Asbestas. The court faction were on his

¹ See *Hergenröther's Photius* for the whole account.

² See § 65.

side, while the people for the most part remained faithful to the legitimate patriarch.

In order to strengthen his position and place the usurped dignity on a firmer footing, Photius anathematized Ignatius and his adherents at a pseudo-synod, and then appealed to the Pope Nicholas I., to whom the imperial court also sent a distinguished embassy laden with costly gifts.

Nicholas¹ appointed the bishops Rodoald of Porto, and Zacharias of Anagni, as his legates (*a latere*) to make the necessary investigation at Constantinople. By presents and threats the party of the false patriarch succeeded in winning over the papal legates to their side. They made common cause with Photius, and signed the document setting aside Ignatius, who was deposed from his dignity in a synod held at Constantinople in 861.

The unhappy patriarch, whom they tried to compel to resign his dignity by every kind of ill treatment, appealed to the Pope, who, after giving the matter a careful examination at a synod convened at Rome (April, 863), annulled the decisions of the Synod of Constantinople and suspended his legates, together with Photius.

The pseudo-patriarch, whose cause was espoused by the Emperor Michael in a most arrogant letter which he addressed to the Pope, did not submit to this sentence, and was now bent on having the Pope himself excommunicated; he having replied in an earnest and dignified manner to the imperial epistle.

The excitement arising between Rome and Constantinople concerning the right of jurisdiction over Bulgaria² facilitated the execution of this plan. Photius, therefore, having won over to his side a great portion of the people and of the youthful school-students, even Basil the Macedonian, the murderer of Bardas, whom Michael had associated with himself as co-ruler, made no long delay; but in the year 867 he addressed a circular letter to the Eastern patriarchs, in which he makes numerous complaints against the Latins, accusing them, among other things, of heresy, in having added to the symbol of faith the words "filioque."

Hereupon a synod held at Constantinople, at which legates, so called, of the Eastern patriarchs were present, completed the work already begun. Here, under the emperor who presided, sentence of excommunication and deposition was pronounced against Pope

¹ The letters of the Pope to the Emperor and Photius. Cf. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. exix. col. 785 sqq.

² See § 84.

Nicholas. For the carrying out of this sentence, Photius, who had added false documents and forged signatures to the synodal acts, relied on King Louis II. By hypocritical and flattering letters, accompanied by presents of various kinds which he sent to Louis and his wife Ingelberga, he confidently hoped to attain the end he desired.

The death of Michael suddenly changed the state of affairs. Basil, his murderer, hoped as emperor to redeem his previous faults. He commanded the schismatical patriarch to retire to the monastery of Skepe, and reinstated the much-tried Ignatius (Nov. 23, 867). But as Photius had many adherents, Basil and Ignatius addressed a letter to Pope Adrian II., who on receipt of the letter convoked a synod at Rome (June, 869), annulled the decrees of the pseudo-councils of 867, and sent three legates to Constantinople, there to preside¹ at

THE EIGHTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (869).

At this synod Photius was excommunicated, and Ignatius re-established in his dignity.

But the good understanding between Rome and Constantinople was not as yet perfectly restored; for the question of jurisdiction in Bulgaria was ever threatening a new conflict. It was in vain that the Apostolic See desired Ignatius to resign the assumed jurisdiction over the Bulgarian Church. At last Pope John VIII. threatened him with excommunication; but when his legates arrived at Constantinople Ignatius was dead (+ Oct. 23, 877).

In the mean time the hypocritical Photius had left no means untried to gain the favor of the court and of the clergy. He had already received permission from the emperor to return to Constantinople. After the death of Ignatius he found a way to repossess himself of the patriarchal chair, and even (though this was on certain conditions) to obtain recognition of his claim from Pope John VIII.

Photius, however, did not fulfil these conditions, but falsified and interpolated the letters which the papal legates had brought to Constantinople, and in November, 879, convoked a synod at which the envoys of the Apostolic See were also present. Photius presided; he deceived the papal legates, who were ignorant of the Greek language, to that degree that the result of this false synod was a triumph of the pseudo-patriarch over his opponents, the rejection of the "filioque," the foundation of a Byzantine primacy, and the condemnation of the Eighth Ecumenical Council.

¹ *Harduin*, v. 749 sqq. Cf. *Hergenröther*.

Pope John VIII., who did not know of the mutilation and falsification of the synodal acts, at first confirmed what had been done in compassion ("misericorditer") for Photius, but rejected all that his legates had done contrary to his instructions; but when he had learned the truth from Cardinal Marinus, who had been sent as administrator, he excommunicated the pseudo-synod together with the patriarch; he also excommunicated the legates.

The controversy was not yet at an end. The schismatic patriarch again laid stress on the "filioque" against the Latins, together with other accusations; but after the death of Basil he had to take up his dwelling-place in a monastery (+ 891), and the Emperor Leo VI. the Philosopher appointed his youngest brother Stephen to the patriarchate. Then the question remained at rest till towards the end of the tenth century, when the patriarchs Sisinnius and Sergius renewed their old objections respecting the Latins. Scarcely less dangerous than these polemical strifes was the friendly relation in which (in 1014-1025) the Emperor Basil II. and his patriarch Eustachius stood to Pope John XIX.; but the danger was happily averted.

The conflict between the Apostolic See and the Greek Church began anew under the haughty and ignorant Michael Cerularius in 1043. He, together with Leo of Achrida, the Metropolitan of Bulgaria, addressed a letter to John, Bishop of Trani in Apulia, in which, among other reproaches, he imputes it to them as a crime, that they use unleavened bread at the Lord's Supper.¹

The signal for the fight was then given. The Emperor Constantine IX. (Monomachus), who, however, had a great interest in preserving unity with Rome, compelled the patriarch to write to the Pope in terms of amity; and he himself also wrote a letter to Leo IX. On this the Pope sent three legates to Constantinople, who brought with them a written refutation of the charges of Cerularius.²

The aversion with which the party of the patriarch received the legates increased to a formal hatred after the publication of the Greek translation of the two writings of Cardinal Humbert, who in a somewhat excited tone, but with great precision, refuted thoroughly the accusations of Cerularius and of the Greek monk Nicetas Pektoratus, as utterly groundless.

As Cerularius would only treat with the legates on conditions which

¹ They also reproach the Latins for fasting on Saturdays, for the drinking of blood and the eating of things strangled, and the omission of the Alleluja during the Lenten fast.

² *Will, Acta et scripta de controversiis eccl. Graecae et Latinae.* Leipsic, 1861.

they could not concede, he broke off all communication with them, and even forbade them to celebrate Mass. He showed himself so hostile to the plans of union proposed by the emperor, that on the 16th July, 1054, the legates laid the act excommunicating the patriarch upon the high altar of St. Sophia's Church. Then they left Constantinople, to which they returned at the entreaty of the emperor, without, however, being able to change the mind of Cerularius. On the contrary, the patriarch excited the populace against the legates in such a manner that they were soon compelled to leave the place. The schismatic patriarch then convoked a synod, and published a synodal letter in which new objections were raised against the Latins, and the legates were denounced as pseudo-legates and impostors whose documents were forged, etc. To gain over the patriarchs of the East, Cerularius addressed similar letters to them; but his plan was only partially successful. After the deposition and banishment of the haughty patriarch (1058) matters between the East and the West changed but little. Since the twelfth century all efforts to effect a permanent reunion seemed to fail.

Of the works of Photius, who was the most learned Greek of his age, the most important is *μυριόβιβλον* ("Bibliotheaca"), which contains an analysis and criticism of two hundred and eighty works; his "Nomocanon" is a collection of laws very well arranged. Other learned men among the Greeks were: Simon Metaphrastes (+ about 977), specially known for his biographies of saints; the interpreters of Holy Scripture, Oeumenius, Bishop of Tricea about 990, Theophylact, Metropolitan of Bulgaria, and Euthymius Zigabenus (+ about 1118), all three of whom were collectors and arrangers rather than original inquirers. Michael Psellus was distinguished as a teacher of philosophy at Constantinople in the eleventh century. Among Greek canonists were the monk Zonares (+ about 1130), Theodore Balsamon (+ 1205), and Blastares (about 1335).¹

§ 102. Adoptionism.

The heresy of Archbishop Elipandus of Toledo and of Bishop Felix of Urgel, that Christ according to his divinity is the natural son of God, but according to his humanity is only the adopted son,² savors of Nestorianism.

¹ See *Migne*, Patr. graec. tom. cxxxvii. sqq.

² *Frobenii*, Diss. de haeresi Elipandi et Felicis in his edition of the works of Alcuin, i. 923 sqq. ap. *Migne*.

The Abbot Beatus of Libana in Asturia, and his pupil, Bishop Etherius of Osma, wrote in Spain against this heresy, the origin of which does not appear; but neither their refutations nor the powerful treatises of Pope Adrian I.¹ availed anything against these obstinate heretics, who reviled and calumniated their opponents, but were by no means induced to renounce their false views.

Charlemagne, to whose kingdom the See of Urgel belonged, summoned in the year 792 a synod at Ratisbon, at which Felix appeared and revoked the erroneous assertions which had been condemned by the Spanish bishops.

But, being still mistrusted, he was sent to Rome, where he again recanted in writing his heretical proposition; but when he returned to his diocese he betook himself to the territory governed by the Saracens, and there preached his former errors again. This occasioned Charlemagne, to whom Elipand and his adherents had appealed, to summon a council to meet at Frankfort (794) "in full apostolic power." The doctrine of adoption was condemned as heretical by the members of this synod, and this decision was confirmed by that of a Roman synod held in the self-same year.

Meantime Alcuin had written a very amiable and conciliatory letter to Felix,² in which he refuted his errors most thoroughly, without, however, making any impression on the deluded bishop, who strove to defend his errors in another treatise which he sent to the emperor. Charlemagne handed it to some learned men for them to confute, and deputed two bishops, Leidrad of Lyons and Nefried of Narbonne, to go with the Abbot Benedict of Aniane to Spain, to bring back the erring one into the Church. They had a conference with Felix at Urgel, and induced him to be present at the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle (799). Here, after a disputation of six days with Alcuin, the heretic acknowledged himself defeated, and made a solemn recantation, on which he was committed to the custody of Bishop Leidrad of Lyons. The misled clergy and laity of Spain also became reconciled with the Church.³ On the other hand, Elipand still clung fast to his errors. Even Felix seems not absolutely to have renounced his views on adoption, on which account Agobard of Lyons, after the death of Felix (+ 816), once again exposed their fallacy.

¹ Cf. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. xvi. col. 847 sqq.

² Cf. *Alcuin*, adv. Elipand. l. i. c. 17 ap. *Migne*, l. c. tom. ci. col. 252.

³ A defender of orthodoxy in Spain was Paul Alvarus of Cordova.

§ 103. *The Heresy of Gottschalk.*

Gottschalk, first an oblate¹ of the monastery of Fulda, then a monk without a vocation at Orbais in the diocese of Soissons, a talented but eccentric man, renewed the errors of predestination by proposing the following system: (1) As God has predestined some men to eternal life, so has he predestined others to eternal death. (2) It is not God's will that all men should be saved. (3) Christ died only for the elect. (4) The sacraments are without efficacy in behalf of the reprobate.

Gottschalk uttered these erroneous views in 847-848, at the court of Eberhard, Count of Friuli, where Bishop Noting, newly appointed Bishop of Verona, was then staying; and he called the attention of the Archbishop Rabanus Maurus of Mentz to the new heresy. Rabanus wrote a refutation of it. Gottschalk, however, accused the archbishop of semi-Pelagianism, and handed to the Synod of Mentz (848) an equivocating profession of faith in order to justify himself. The assembled bishops condemned the heretic and delivered him up to his metropolitan, Archbishop Hinemar of Rheims, to whom they also sent a letter from the synod drawn up by Rabanus.

Hinemar then convoked the Synod of Quiercy (Carisiarcum) in 849, in which the doctrine of the twofold predestination was condemned. As Gottschalk did not submit to this decision, he was, in accordance with the Rule of St. Benedict, subjected to corporal punishment, and shut up in the cloister Hautvillier (Altavilla), after having first been compelled to commit his writings to the flames. But this punishment failed to convert the offender. Gottschalk remained obstinate, drew up two new incorrect confessions of faith, and offered to stand the ordeal of fire.

The controversy was now spread over a wider field; for several learned men defended the twofold predestination, without, however, committing themselves to the errors of Gottschalk. To these belong especially Ratramnus, monk of Corvey, Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières near Sens, and Prudentius, Bishop of Troyes, whose writing was approved by the Synod of Paris (849). They were combated by Rabanus, Pardulus, Bishop of Laon, and Hinemar, who persuaded Scotus Erigena to take part in the controversy. But the work of Erigena, "De praedestinatione," written from a philosophical point of view, is full of errors, and formed a target for the shafts of the

¹ See § 97.

opponent. It was combated by Prudentius and Magister Florus, who had formerly written against Gottschalk.

If the position of Hinemar towards the church at Lyons had in this way become somewhat cloudy, it became yet more so under Archbishop Remigius, the successor of Amolo, who in his writing to Hinemar and Pardulus, controverted their views and even submitted the letter of Rabanus to Noting to a critical inquiry.

The second Synod of Quiercy, which Hinemar summoned in 853 at the behest of Charles the Bald, decreed four articles to the effect (1) That there is but one predestination, the object of which is either the conferring of grace or the recompense of justice; (2) That the free-will of man, in order to effect good, needs prevenient and assisting grace; (3) That God will have all men to be saved; (4) That Christ died for all men.¹

Prudentius met these four articles with four counter capitula, and induced the Archbishop Remigius to draw up a new polemical treatise in which various objections were made to the four articles. In the Synod of Valence, over which Remigius presided in 855, and at which Ebbo, Bishop of Grenoble, was specially active, six counter articles were presented, to which Hinemar replied; but they in no way favor the false theory of predestination; the question had become a quibble on terms, and the matter was finally brought to a close at an informal synod of Toul in 859, when the bishops came together to discuss the matter in an informal manner.

But Gottschalk, who had accused the Archbishop Hinemar of Sabellianism, because he had used the expression "saneta Deitas," instead of "trina Deitas," did not renounce his errors, and died in the year 868, unreconciled with the Church.

§ 104. *Controversy on the Holy Eucharist.*

The occasion for the first controversy on this subject of the Holy Eucharist was given by Paschasius Radbert, who was Abbot of Old Corvey from 844 (+ 865). In a work he composed "on the Body and Blood of our Lord," for the instruction of the students at the monastery of New Corvey in 831, he used the expression that in

¹ *Harduin*, v. 18. Art. 2 says: *Libertatem arbitrii in primo homine perdidimus, quam per Christum Dominum nostrum recipimus: et habemus liberum arbitrium ad bonum, praeventum et adjutum gratia, et habemus liberum arbitrium ad malum, desertum gratia.* Liberum autem habemus arbitrium, quia gratia liberatum et gratia de corrupto sanatum.

the Holy Sacrament "there is absolutely no other flesh than that which was born of Mary, suffered on the cross, and rose from the dead."

These words, which might be easily mistaken to signify an entire identity, both in substance and appearance, of the Body of Christ born of Mary with the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, gave offence to some of his contemporaries, who attacked the "Capharnaitic" views of the learned and pious monk, who very decidedly repudiated the construction put on his words.

The opponents of Radbert are of two classes: those of the orthodox, who only found fault with the expression so liable to be mistaken; and others who entertained erroneous views on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

Among the first were Rabanus Maurus, who in a letter to the Abbot Egilo of Prüm opposed the Capharnaitic view,¹ and the monk Ratramnus of Old Corvey, whose wording on the subject is, however, so obscure as to render it undetermined what he really intended to say respecting the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Other opponents of Radbert's gave utterance to heretical propositions, and recognized in the Holy Eucharist simply a *VIRTUS*, or, as Scotus Erigena,² who also mingled in the strife, expresses it, a "memoria corporis Christi" (a memorial of the body of Christ).

During the controversy the Stercoran idea, that the Holy Eucharist was subjected to the process of digestion, was discussed. Radbert opposed this "frivolous" opinion, while Rabanus Maurus and Amalarius of Metz, Chorbishop of Lyons, by inconsiderate remarks, drew upon themselves the reproach of Stercoranism.

The renowned Gerbert (Sylvester II.)³ put an end to the discussion in a very lucid manner. He defended St. Paschasius Radbert against the accusations brought against him, and proved efficiently that no real difference existed between him and his orthodox opponents, thus ending the debate on Stercoranism.

But while, in the first controversy on the Lord's Supper, the true and substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar was

¹ *Migne*, l. c. tom. cxii. col. 1510 sqq. In the letter it is written: Non *naturaliter* sed *specialiter* aliud esse corpus Domini, quod ex substantia panis ac vini pro mundi vita quotidie per Spiritum Sanctum consecratur, quod a sacerdote postmodum Deo Patri suppliciter offertur; et aliud *specialiter* corpus Christi quod natum est de Maria Virgine, in quod istud transfertur.

² The writing of Scotus was burnt at the Synod of Vercelli, 1050.

³ *De corp. et sang. Dom.*

not an object of contention, this question became the foremost one in the second controversy respecting the Holy Eucharist.

The dispute originated with Berengarius, Scholastic of Tours, and from the year 1040 Archdeacon of Angers,¹ who denied the change of substance (transubstantiation), without, however, explaining himself clearly concerning the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

The friendly attempts of Adelmanus, Scholastic of Liege, and of Bishop Hugh of Langres, failed to convince Berengarius of his error. So far from it, he asserted himself even more openly; and in writing to Lanfranc defended the book of Scotus Erigena, which drew upon him the sentence of excommunication from a Roman synod in 1050, which sentence was ratified at the Synod of Vereelli (September, 1050) and at that of Paris (October, 1050).

Berengarius now appeared willing to renounce his errors. At a synod of Tours, in which Hildebrand presided (1054 or 1055), he acknowledged that "after the consecration the bread and wine are the flesh and blood of Christ." In the year 1059 he at a great Roman synod accepted under oath a confession of faith, drawn up by Cardinal Humbert, which expresses the real presence of Christ in the blessed sacrament with great distinctness.

This confession was, however, not sincere on his part. Berengarius fell back into his errors; on which account the heretic, who responded to the amiable and conciliatory advances of Pope Alexander II. with abusive and insolent language, was repeatedly excommunicated by the French bishops, and at the Roman synod under Gregory VII. (1078) escaped condemnation as a heretic only by declaring under oath that the bread of the altar is, after the consecration, the true Body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary.

In order to cut off all means of retrogression from the wily heretic, he was required, at a synod held at Rome in the following year, to subscribe under oath a formula of faith, in which the substantial change of the bread and wine was expressed with such precision and clearness as to render any subterfuge impossible.²

¹ *Sudendorf, Berengarius Turonensis. Hejèle, Hist. of the Councils, iv. 702 sqq.*

² *Lanfranc, l. c.* Berengarius was compelled to acknowledge under oath: *Panem et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari per mysterium sacrae orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram et propriam ac vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi et post consecrationem esse verum Christi corpus, quod natum est de Virgine et quod pro salute mundi oblatum in cruce pepenit, et quod sedet ad dexteram Patris, et verum sanguinem Christi, qui de latere ejus effusus est, non tantum per signum et virtutem sacramenti, sed in proprietate naturae et veritate substantiae, etc.*

From this time forth, Berengarius, who had been required to promise on oath nevermore to argue concerning the Holy Eucharist, except to bring back those whom he had misled, withdrew to the island of St. Cosmas, near Tours, where he died, at peace with the Church, in 1088.

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

§ 105. *The Holy Sacraments. — Ecclesiastical Punishments.*¹

THE synods very strongly urged the duty incumbent on parents not to put off the baptism of their children, and to provide for their religious education, in which latter they were to be assisted by the pastors and sponsors.

They likewise admonished the faithful to receive in due time the Viaticum and Extreme Unction in the case of severe sickness.

The law on marriage underwent some slight changes; for instance, the impediment of relationship was extended to the seventh degree of relationship.

The celebration of the Holy Eucharist was rendered more solemn by the introduction of choral chanting, which, being still more promoted by the accompaniment of the organ,² spread with the Latin Liturgy in all directions.

Mass was celebrated sometimes by the priests in communion with the bishop, sometimes by the priests alone. It could be offered up for the whole congregation or for individuals. A priest was allowed to say several Masses in one day; but the synodal decrees forbade Mass to be said without the presence of the faithful, or at least the presence of a servitor or acolyte. Women were not allowed to serve at Mass. The former oblations were now replaced by the stipends as alms for the celebrating priest, the acceptance of which was permitted.

The elements of the Holy Eucharist (wheaten bread and wine) were prepared with great care during the Middle Ages. The hosts ("hostia," "oblata") were round, and of white color. Holy communion was usually given under both species. The administering clergyman laid (from the tenth century) the Body of Christ on the tongue of the recipient. The sacred Blood was taken by means of a tube ("fistula eucharistica"), or the sacred host was steeped in it.

¹ See §§ 33-36.

² *Einh. Ann.* 757.

Some learned men, as Amalarius of Metz, composed peculiar liturgical writings, in which they sought to disclose the mystic sense of the ecclesiastical ceremonies to the faithful.

The Church bestowed great care in the administration of the sacrament of penance, specially insisting on the interior contrition and conversion of the heart on the part of the penitent. The father confessor was specially called upon to examine into the state of the penitent's conscience.¹ Secret and public penance were both in use at this time.

The penitential works imposed at that era were strict fasts and other practices in use in the earlier centuries, in pilgrimages and bodily chastisements. But in accordance with a custom of the Germanic nations, these were frequently commuted into fines of money; and not unfrequently penances were shortened, or even remitted altogether, by an indulgence.

There were penitential works in the hands of the faithful, which contained an account of the practices used for penance. But these were only private works, which not only differed one from the other in the instructions given, but occasionally were composed with too little reference to the established laws of the Church, and here and there were in direct contradiction to her ordinances, so that in the ninth century the clerical superiors rejected these books, and ordered collections to be made of sentences from the Fathers, the Canons and the Decretals, which they brought into use without being able, however, entirely to suppress the penitential books.

Besides the penitential books, others were compiled for the use of the clergy, such as rituals and formularies. The former contained the regulations for the due performance of divine service; the latter gave the forms for the transaction of clerical or ecclesiastical business.

Besides the anathema, the interdict was used as an ecclesiastical punishment, and was inflicted upon cities, provinces, or countries, the rulers or inhabitants of which had become guilty of a great crime, and refused to do penance or give the satisfaction required.

¹ Cf. Conc. Wormat. (968), c. 25: *Poenitentibus secundum differentiam peccatorum, sacerdotis arbitrio poenitentiae decernuntur. Debet itaque sacerdos in poenitentia danda singulorum causas singulatum considerare, originem quoque modumque culparum, et affectus gemitusque delinquentium diligenter examinare, manifesteque cognoscere, temporum etiam et personarum, locorum quoque et aetatum qualitates inspicere, ut etiam pro consideratione locorum, aetatum vel temporum, seu pro qualitate delictorum atque gemituum uniuscujusque delinquentis, a sacris regulis oculos non reflectat.*

§ 106. *Veneration of the Saints.*

Guided by the instincts of faith, the nations of the Middle Ages manifested in various ways their love and veneration for the saints. From the first, these sentiments showed themselves in the celebration of festivals in honor of the saints; these were increased at this epoch, and in addition to the feasts came reverence for their relics and for their images. The latter practice called forth the opposition of those who saw in it an exaggerated devotion, and who, owing to erroneous principles, were more or less averse to the thing itself.¹

Special catalogues of the saints, with a short sketch of their lives and an account of the manner of their death (martyrologies), were compiled from other works by Wandebert, a monk of the cloister of Prüm (840-850); by Usnard, of St. Germain at Paris (860-870); and by Ado, who was afterwards Archbishop of Vienne (+ 874).

Among the saints the Blessed Virgin Mary enjoyed a peculiar and extraordinary degree of veneration. Hymns were composed in her praise, festivals instituted in her honor;² the “Officium Mariae” (Office of the Blessed Virgin) was recited, and many other prayers were said to her,—such as the Rosary, which received its present form from St. Dominic,—to which may be added the keeping of Saturday in her honor.

The feasts of All-Saints and of All-Souls express in a magnificent and intelligible manner the Catholic belief in the intimate intercourse subsisting between the suffering and the triumphant Church.

Before the tenth century the bishops had the right of canonization, which since then has been exclusively exercised by the Apostolic See.³ The first example of a papal canonization is that of Bishop Ulric of Augsburg, which was performed by Pope John XV. in the year 993.

The Greek Church celebrated a peculiar feast called the Feast of Orthodoxy (*ἡ κυριακὴ τῆς ὁρθοδοξίας*).⁴

¹ See § 100.

² Compare *Hergenröther*, Veneration of the Blessed Virgin in the first ten Centuries of the Church.

³ *Bened. XIV.* : De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione. The difference between beatification and canonization consists in this, that the feast of a beatified saint may be celebrated only in some churches and with certain restrictions. Beatification precedes canonization.

⁴ See § 100.

§ 107. *The Clergy.*

The solicitude of the Church for the efficient education of the clergy is amply proved by the care she has taken in founding schools of learning¹ in which the future pastors of souls might receive a scientific and religious training, such as might qualify them to fulfil their office as dispensers of the divine graces and teachers of the eternal truths to the flocks who are intrusted to their care, that they may guide them to eternal happiness. Above all things, the Church required that the clergy should illustrate the beauty of their doctrine by the holiness of their lives. With this view, which she repeatedly urged upon them, she set before them the splendid book of Gregory the Great, called "Regula pastoris" (The Rule for a Pastor's Life), in which the holy Pope presents the ideal of a pastor of souls, which ideal the decrees of the synods on the household, dress, and employment of the clergy were calculated to realize.

According to the instruction of the great Pope, pastors should perform their pastoral duties with zeal, should conscientiously exercise their sacred functions, administer with devout exterior and due form the sacraments to the faithful, and thoroughly instruct them in the truths of salvation.² The synods particularly inculcate on the higher as well as the lower clergy that it is their duty to watch over the instruction of youth, to be careful to exercise their office of preacher in a manner useful to the congregation they have to guide, and to be particularly attentive and diligent in the administration of the sacrament of penance.

For such pastors as were not in a condition to bring out original sermons, Charlemagne ordered Paul the Deacon to compose a series of sermons after the manner of those of the Venerable Bede, to be read by the priest to the people for their instruction.

Unfortunately the reality did not always correspond to this ideal conception of the priesthood. Whilst the better part of the clergy lived worthily according to the vocation wherewith they were called (Eph. iv. 1), there were others who were slaves to their passions, and who by their ignorance and offensive conduct contributed not a little to the disrepute into which the clergy at times fell.

Such improprieties of conduct, the source of which we have already pointed out,³ must necessarily be stated by an impartial

¹ See §§ 98, 99.

² The Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle (836) gives an excellent description of these duties.

³ See § 96.

historian. But such a historian is not permitted to exaggerate the dark side of the picture, and present but a one-sided view ; he must not represent the evil as universal, and vilify the whole of the clergy of the age on account of some unworthy members. He must especially direct attention to these facts : (1) That only the violation of ecclesiastical rule occasioned the lapse of morality ; (2) That the ecclesiastical authorities waged an irreconcilable warfare with these evils, which they disclosed with a praiseworthy openness ; (3) That a very large number of the clergy corresponded to the moral and intelligent requirements of their state in life, and placed themselves in the front ranks to battle against the worldly spirit among the clerical body.

§ 108. *Christian Life.*

The influence of Christianity on public life showed itself principally in the religious stamp it impressed on political life, although human passion frequently violated the principles it professed.

The idea which the Middle Ages conceived of the real relation which a ruler bore to his subjects is best exemplified by the ceremonies accompanying the coronation of a king by the bishops, in which the people acknowledged the dignity of the prince to be "by the grace of God," at the same time that the "crowned king" is admonished that he holds the sword to wield it for the honor of God, to govern his people in justice,¹ thus excluding the idea of absolutism on the one side and of anarchy on the other.

As the king received the crown at the hand of the bishop, so also the Christian knight received his sword from the Church, or at least with such religious ceremonies as were calculated to inculcate on him the duty of using his weapon in the service and defence of the Church.

Other evidences of the Christian character of public life are the laws respecting the religious observance of Sunday,² on the relation the bondsmen held towards their masters, the punishments threat-

¹ Conc. Paris (826), c. 1 : Rex a recte agenda vocatur. Si enim pie et juste et misericorditer regit, merito rex appellatur ; si his caruerit, non rex sed tyrannus est. Scire etiam debet (scil. rex), quod causa, quam juxta ministerium sibi commissum administrat, non hominum, sed Dei causa existit, cui pro ministerio, quod suscepit, in examinis tremendi die rationem redditurus est. (c. 2.)

² Capit. 1 ann. 789, c. 79 : Statiuimus secundum quod et in lege Dominus praecepit, ut opera servilia diebus Dominicis non agantur . . . ut omnimodis honor et requies diei Dominicci servetur. Sed et ad missarum solemnia ad ecclesiam undique conveniant et laudent Deum in omnibus bonis, quae nobis in illo die fecit.

ened to those who violated the laws of the Church, from contempt: remarkable also are the public penances at the periods of great calamities which were ordered by synods or kings. To these evidences we may subjoin the right of asylum belonging to the Church, which was held sacred.

Another very pleasing evidence of the interior change in the Germanic nations, effected by Christianity, is the gradual eradication of those ancient pagan practices which had struck deep root into their customs, being sanctioned by their laws and upheld by human passions. Such, among the Germans, was the right of revenge by blood, elevated by them into a duty for the maintenance of their honor, and the feuds among themselves to which the Church opposed herself in pointing to the perfect deliverance of mankind from the vengeance of blood by the Son of God; and though with great difficulty, she succeeded at length in establishing the "Truce of God" ("Treuga Dei"), thereby setting a dam at first to a practice which she hoped finally to abolish, and which she did abolish after a time in spite of all resistance.

The Church waged war not only with the feudal strifes, but with the ordeals, or so-called judgments of God. These were originally a German pagan practice, interwoven with their whole constitution and not wholly reprehensible in themselves. The Church first stripped these ordeals of their heathenish character by imparting to them a religious one, and then suppressed them altogether; this latter was not, however, effected without much opposition. How much the spirit of Christianity pervaded family life is borne witness to by the many holy men and women whose first school of piety had been at the fireside hearth at home; by the many institutions founded either for religious purposes or for the support of the poor, the sick, or the suffering; by the love for monastic life; and, above all, by the reverence felt for the Church, and the submission paid to her authority.

In this way the Church, without temporal power and harassed by continual hostilities, opened her mission among the people of the Middle Ages, and already, at the end of this epoch, had obtained most glorious results of her laborious and restless activity.

The Church of the West had thus, chiefly through her supreme head, the Pope, brought the rude and warlike Germans from a state of chaotic confusion, consequent on the migration of nations, into a condition of intellectual and moral cultivation, and formed them into well-organized States. She had substituted spiritual authority for

material power, and had sanctified the relationships between the ruler and the subject by upholding the majesty of the one, while protecting the liberty of the other ; and in restoring the Western Roman Empire she gave to the nations of the Middle Ages a political central point. She inspired heroic deeds ; more than once she hindered the outbreaks of revenge and reunited the separated. The schismatical Church of the East, on the other hand, after its separation from Rome, had the fate of a branch severed from the parent vine.

PERIOD II.

FROM GREGORY VII. TO THE SO-CALLED
REFORMATION.

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 109. *The Crusades.*

THE conquering of Syria by the Mahometans had not at first the bad consequences which had been feared; for the first caliphs allowed, under certain conditions, the exercise of Christian worship and the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Under the dynasty of the Abbasides the condition of the Christians was also, on the whole, tolerable. It changed somewhat for the worse during the dominion of the Fatimites; but the highest grade of suffering was reached under the fierce Seljuk-Turks, who in the year 1072 had taken possession of and plundered the Holy City.

It was then that Gregory VII. conceived the plan of liberating the sacred places; but the sad state of affairs in the West prevented the carrying of his project into execution. Nor was Victor III. more fortunate than his predecessor. Urban II., however, at the Synods of Piacenza (1095) and of Clermont (1095), succeeded in inducing the nations of the West, whose enthusiasm had already been enkindled by Peter the Hermit, to start for the first crusade.¹

At the head of the army, which counted 600,000 men, stood the gallant knight, Godfrey de Bouillon. The Crusaders reached Syria; and, in spite of the machinations of the wily Greeks, and of great

¹ Conc. Clarom. c. 2: *Quicunque pro sola devotione, n- n pro honoris vel pecuniae adēptione ad liberandam ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni poenitentia reputetur* (*Harduin*, vi. 2 col. 1718). In order to obtain the blessing of heaven, Urban prescribed the Off. Marianum for the clergy.

want of union in their own camp, they took Jerusalem, July 15, 1099, and proclaimed Godfrey king.

The new kingdom, to the defence of which the Knights of St. John and the Templars devoted themselves, did not last long. Interior dissensions and other causes gave the Saracens an easy victory. Emaddin Zenki seized upon the distracted kingdom, and in 1144 took the strong fortress of Edessa.

In order to avert the threatened danger from Jerusalem, the Emperor Conrad III. and King Louis VII. of France, excited to the enterprise by St. Bernard, undertook a second crusade. The result did not correspond to the magnificent equipment. The greater part of the German army was slaughtered in the defiles of Taurus, while the French troops were defeated near Laodicea. Yet, being reinforced from the West, the fragments of both armies joined forces and together laid siege to Damascus; but, from the pitiful envy raging within their own camp and from the treachery of their allies, they were compelled to raise the siege and return crestfallen to their own homes. After their departure the condition of the Christian kingdom became more and more critical, until finally Saladin, in 1187, after the unfortunate battle near Tiberias, conquered the Holy City.

The Apostolic See, which imposed the Saladin tithe upon the clergy and granted extensive privileges to the Crusaders, now renewed its efforts to excite the princes of the West to a new crusade. The army, under the leadership of Frederic I. and the two kings, Philip Augustus of France, and Richard the Lion-Heart of England (*Cœur de Lion*), justly excited great hopes of success, which, unfortunately, were not fulfilled. After obtaining a victory over the Sultan of Iconium, the emperor met his death in the waves of the Calycadnus of Cilicia. Quarrels broke out among the other leaders, who, in July, 1191, had taken Ptolemais (Acre); and these quarrels rendered all further conquests impossible. The whole result of the undertaking was the possession of Acre, the founding of the order of Teutonic Knights, and an armistice of three years, concluded between Richard and Saladin.

The Western knights were by no means satisfied with this termination, but they contented themselves with fault-finding; and the several divisions of the army which in 1196 had gone to the East, returned home each by his separate way.

It was Pope Innocent III. who brought about the fourth crusade. It was preached by Fulco of Neuilly (+ 1202), who was commis-

sioned thereto by the Pope. Baldwin of Flanders and Boniface of Montferrat headed the Crusaders. But the army was more effective in serving the interests of the shrewd, ninety-year-old Doge of Venice than in working for the good of the Church; for, in spite of the prohibition of the Pope, the army took Zara in Dalmatia for the Venetians before it proceeded to Constantinople, which, having reached, it took possession of, and founded the Latin Empire (1203-1261). Baldwin became its first emperor, and the Venetian Morosini was appointed Latin Patriarch of Constantinople. No advantage to the Christians in Syria accrued from this event, and the hatred of the Greeks to the Latins received new fuel.

It was under the pontificate of this same Innocent III. that forty thousand children from France and England sallied forth to conquer the Holy Land.¹

His successor, Honorius III., brought the fifth crusade to bear. At the head of the armies stood King Andrew II. of Hungary, who, however, on some discontent with the barons of Palestine, left the Holy Land. On this, Leopold VII. (the Glorious) of Austria, in union with King John of Brienne, undertook an expedition into Egypt. Circumstances favored the Crusaders. Damietta, the key to Egypt, fell into their power in November, 1219; but, two years later, this important fortress again fell into the hands of the Saracens, and all in vain had been the immense sacrifice of men and money that Christendom had made.

The chief person to blame for the issue of this unfortunate crusade was the Emperor Frederic II., who sacrificed the most sacred interests to an egotistical policy, and, notwithstanding the promises which he had frequently repeated on oath, did not fulfil those promises. It was not till a malignant fever had carried off thousands of the best soldiers, that Frederic, in June, 1228, being then an excommunicated man, set out with a very small escort to Acre. His conduct in the East was in conformity with his real sentiments. The clergy and knights who avoided intercourse with him as an excommunicated man naturally fell under his resentment, while he was very friendly towards the Saracens, to whom he gave many proofs of his good will. At length he concluded an armistice of

¹ *Hurter*, ii. 452 sqq. In France the crusade was preached by a shepherd boy, Stephen of Cloies, near Vendome; in Germany by a ten-year-old boy, named Nicholas. Grown persons joined the youthful associates. At the Fourth Council of the Lateran resolutions were passed respecting a new crusade. (*Harduin*, vii. 71 sqq.)

ten years with Kamel, Sultan of Egypt, on terms apparently favorable to the Christians: these were to be put in possession of the whole of Jerusalem, excepting the Temple or Mosque of Omar and of some other places. Frederic, having placed the crown of Jerusalem on his own head, departed in May, 1229, returning to his own country.

This situation, untenable in itself, was rendered yet worse by the partial dissolution of the Military Orders, and by the relations the Christians had entered into with the Saracens. It lasted, with short interruptions, to the year 1244, when Saleh, Sultan of Egypt, by the aid of the wild Khwaresmian tribe, took the Holy City and committed many atrocities. Then once again the Christians took up arms to defend themselves against the tyrant; but that army was almost entirely annihilated at the battle of Gaza, owing to the overpowering strength of the enemy and the perfidy of false friends.

Pope Innocent IV. then raised his voice in favor of the Holy Land at the Council of Lyons; but his urgent entreaty moved only one ruler, Louis IX. of France, to undertake the sixth crusade. The field of battle was Egypt. The arms of the Christians were at first victorious; even Damietta surrendered, in 1249. But, owing to the foolish temerity of the king's brother, the Count d'Artois, the fruits of this victory were lost. In 1250, near Mansura, Louis was taken prisoner by the Sultan, and compelled to relinquish the conquered territory. Twenty years later, the pious king undertook the seventh crusade against Tunis, but was snatched away by a virulent fever, which broke out in his camp near Carthage and carried off many of his soldiers with him.

After this the Christian power in Syria departed with giant strides. One possession after another was lost, till in the year 1291 Acre also fell, after which the smaller places, cities as well as fortresses, had to succumb.

Although the peculiar object for which the Crusades had been undertaken was not fully attained,¹ yet are these same Crusades of great importance in the history of the Church, because in them we view the genuine religious spirit of the Middle Ages, and especially of knighthood; while the indefatigable zeal of the Apostolic See and of the clergy for the cause of God displays itself. It was faith

¹ It was scarcely a smaller advantage which the Crusades brought to Europe in the fact that they protected Christian Europe from the attacks of Islamism and its devastations.

in Christ and love to him, that called forth these processions of whole nations. Other motives, such as desire of booty, may have affected the individual here and there, but they were far from influencing the vast majority.

Of all the various charges trumped up to disparage the Crusades, none are more contrary to historical facts, none more unfounded, than the assertion that the motive which led to them was fanaticism, and that the consequence was intolerance.

§ 110. *Christianity in the Interior of Asia, especially in the Empire of the Mongols.*

However unwarranted by historical fact may be the account of the great kingdom of the priest-king, Prester John (Wan-Khan, or Un-Khan), yet it is undoubtedly true that Nestorian monks preached the gospel in the interior of Asia, and converted several Tartar tribes.

These Christian Tartars, at a later date, fell under the dominion of the Mongols, who, under Genghis-Khan (+ 1227) and his son Otkai (+ 1241), subjugated a great part of Asia, and extended their conquests to Hungary and Poland.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Popes sent missionaries, chiefly mendicant monks, to convert these Mongols, by whom the peace of Europe was so greatly threatened. The missionaries met with a good reception among these people, who are tolerant towards those differing from them in belief, but they were not able to convert them, and had to leave the country without establishing Christianity therein. Such was the fate of the Franciscans and Dominicans sent by Innocent IV.

After the death of Mangus, his brothers divided the empire between them. Hulagu obtained Persia, and Kublai China. Both of these permitted Christianity to be preached, and Hulagu's son even sent an embassy to Pope Gregory X. at the Council of Lyons (1274).

The prospects of Christianity became favorable in China, concerning the interior condition of which interesting details have come down to us from the Venetian merchants Nicholas and Marco Polo. The venerable Franciscan Father, John of Monte Corvino (+ 1330), was sent thither by Nicholas IV. He baptized six thousand men in Kambula (Pekin), and built two churches. Pope Clement V. nominated him Archbishop of Pekin, and sent to his assistance seven monks, also consecrated bishops, of whom three only reached their

destination. The work of conversion, however, did not progress according to expectation, as neither the chiefs nor the mass of the people entered the Church.

The fall of the Mongolian dynasty in China in 1369 brought with it the dissolution of such communities as had already been founded.

§ 111. *Christianity in the West.—Conversion of the Pomeranians and of other Slavonic Tribes.*

The first efforts to introduce Christianity into Pomerania failed on account of the inflexibility of the inhabitants, who clung to their many-headed idols in the fear that by giving these up they would also have to give up their political independence; and the Bishopric of Salz-Kolberg, founded by Boleslaw Chrobry, Duke of Poland, ceased to exist after its first bishop, Reinbern, had been murdered (1015-1017).

After the victories of Boleslaus III. (1107), who subdued the country, new efforts to convert the Pomeranians were made. The first missionary, the Spanish monk Bernard, excited mockery by the poverty of his dress, and had to leave the country. His successor, St. Otho, legate of Pope Calixtus II., was more fortunate: being acquainted with the character and views of the people, he made his appearance in Pomerania with all the splendor of a noble prince.

In Pyritz and Camin he converted many natives; and after his first attempt to Christianize the inhabitants had failed, he went on to Stettin, where, after a long resistance, he obtained permission to preach the Christian faith. Otho did this with great success, and then returned to Julin, where he at this time also received many heathens into the Church. Other cities also received Christianity.

To his own regret and that of his new converts, the holy bishop was obliged, in 1125, to return to his own diocese, and was not able to take his second missionary journey till 1128. Otho then turned his attention to the Leutizians, and preached in the places where he had previously labored. He succeeded not only in converting many heathens, but also in reconciling many apostates to the Church.

After his death, in 1139, Julin was created a bishopric, and Adalbert, the companion of Otho, was appointed its first bishop. The bishopric was placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See by Innocent II. (1140), and transferred to Camin (1170).

At this epoch the earlier attempts at conversion were renewed in North Germany among those Slavic tribes that, after the murder of the valiant Duke Gottschalk, had returned to the primitive abominations of heathenism, and had cruelly persecuted Christianity ; but these attempts were not very successful.

The conduct of Christian princes who, while on the one hand they protected with their arms the spread of the gospel, on the other created great difficulties by encroaching on the privileges of the Church by quarrelling on the subject of investitures and the like, caused great embarrassments to the missionaries, among whom St. Vicelin (+ 1154) is specially distinguished.

The hard treatment inflicted on the subjugated tribes by Henry the Lion excited a sedition. The insurgents were defeated, and their devastated country peopled by German colonists. Had the temporal rulers been as intent on forwarding the cause of God as they were in seeking to advance their own interests, the Christian religion would have gained a speedier and an easier triumph over paganism.

The island of Rügen, which was a main seat of Slavic paganism, also became accessible to the missionaries of the twelfth century. In 1168 the Danish king, Waldemar, took Arkona, the capital of the island ; after which Absalon, Bishop of Roskild, preached the gospel there. In the year 1193 the first convent for nuns was built at Bergen, and in 1203 the first monastery for monks at Eldena.

§ 112. *Christianity among the Finnish-Lettish Tribes.—Conversion of the Lithuanians.*

In Finland, the inhabitants of which made such continual irruptions into the Swedish kingdom that they compelled King Eric IX. to take up arms and conquer their country (1156), the seeds of the faith were sown by Henry, Bishop of Upsala, who was the first bishop of Randameeki, afterwards transferred to Aboe ; but among this rude and ignorant people the fruits he reaped were but few.

The first news of Christianity was brought to Livonia by merchants from Bremen, whereupon, in 1186, the Augustinian monk, Meinhard, from the monastery of Siegeberg, preached the faith and built the first church at Yxkuell on the banks of the Dwina.

Unfortunately, the zealous missionary, who was consecrated bishop by the Archbishop Hartwig, of Bremen, lived to witness the apostasy of many of his new converts, and had but little success in his

laborious task of converting the people, owing to continual hostilities on the part of the heathen Livonians.

His successor, Berthold, had but little better success. He lost his life in a battle against the natives (1198). Albert of Apeldern, third bishop of Livonia, who transferred his see to Riga, 1201, founded the order of "Sword-bearers" ("fratres militiae Christi"), for the protection of Christians (1202), of which Winno of Rohrbach was the first grand-master. Albert induced Pope Innocent III. to inaugurate a crusade to put an end to the devastations of the heathen.

By the united exertions of the knights and the crusaders, the Livonians, Esthonians, Lettis, and Semgallians were gradually subjugated. The inhabitants of Courland submitted of their own free-will, and, like the inhabitants of the conquered country, accepted Christianity (1230).

In the year 1237 the Sword-bearers became affiliated to the Teutonic Order, but the hopes for the progress of the missions based on this union were not realized. The partial failure of the missions was owing somewhat to the stupidity of the people, but still more to the harsh conduct of the knights and their conflicts with the bishops, and to the quarrel between the archbishops of Lund and Riga regarding the jurisdiction of Esthonia; but most of all to the non-observance of the papal decrees which enforced the preservation of liberty and of their peculiar institutions to these people, in so far as these did not run counter to Christianity.

In 997 St. Adalbert of Prague went to the heathen Prussians, who in their sacred groves offered bloody and unbloody sacrifices to their idols; but not long after this he suffered martyrdom. St. Bruno and his eighteen companions met with a like fate in 1009. Nor were the efforts of Bishop Henry of Olmutz and the Polish crusaders crowned with success. Godfrey, Abbot of Lukina (1207), and Christian, a Cistercian monk from the year 1209, were more fortunate; the latter was consecrated bishop by Pope Innocent III., and invested with full powers to preach the faith in Prussia. But it happened that the work which the new bishop was building up with so much toil, and which the Christian dukes of Poland rather impeded than forwarded, was destroyed by the fury of the pagans, on which the bishop appealed to Pope Honorius for aid; and the Pope inaugurated a crusade for the protection of the new converts, and to the best of his power supported the endeavor to establish schools in Prussia and to educate Prussian youths as missionaries.

The crusaders, however, could not afford the Christians any lasting, effective protection; for which reason Bishop Christian had several fortresses fortified, and instituted the order of Knights of Christ ("milites Christi"), in order to repress the hostilities of the heathen. Conrad, Duke of Masovia, whose country was likewise greatly devastated by the heathen, donated them the fort and territory of Dobrin.

The new order having unfortunately met with a total defeat in the bloody battle near Strasburg, Christian invoked the aid of the Teutonic Knights, who with the approval of Gregory IX. went to Prussia in 1229, under the leadership of Herman von Balk, and after many battles conquered the country, of which they took possession in 1283.

Besides Christian, the Polish monk Hyacinth (+1257) and William, Bishop of Modena, labored in Prussia with great success. Under Pope Innocent IV. (1245), the land was divided into the bishoprics of Culm, Pomesania, and Ermland; and after the crusade of Ottocar, King of Bohemia, another was founded at Samland. After the year 1253 these bishoprics were under the jurisdiction of Riga. The Pope assigned one third of the conquered country to the bishops, and the rest belonged to the knights, who unfortunately too frequently preferred their own interests to the cause of God, and misused their ecclesiastical privileges.

Bishop Vitus, of the Dominican Order, had preached to the Lithuanians as early as 1252; but it was not until the conversion of the great prince Jagello, who married the young queen Hedwige of Poland, and under the name of Ladislaus united the two kingdoms, that Christianity was proclaimed to be the State religion at a diet of Wilna. Through the efforts of Ladislaus Christianity was introduced to the Samaites in 1413. The inhabitants of Lapland, who were subject to the Swedish dominion, had adopted the faith as early as 1335.

§ 113. *Attempts to convert the Mahometans. — Fate of the Jews.*

Whilst Western Christendom was pledging life and possessions in order to free the holy places and their Christian inhabitants from the Mahometan yoke, high-hearted men were not slack in going to the Mahometans themselves as messengers of the faith; but neither the divinely inspired address of St. Francis of Assisi, before Kamel, the Sultan of Egypt, nor the heroic exertions of Raymond Lullus

and others, could induce the followers of the Prophet to become servants of Christ.

In the mountains of Asturia, in Spain, an independent Christian kingdom still existed. The other parts of the country had been subjugated by the Moors (Mauri), who in 756 founded the Caliphate of Cordova.

The Christians were exposed to many hardships under the rule of the Moslems. Under Abder-Ramann II., in the year 850, a bloody persecution broke out, to which St. Perfectus fell the first victim. Still more cruel was the conduct of his fanatical successor, Mohammed, against his Christian subjects, who, encouraged by St. Eulogius and his friend Alvarus, would not listen to the propositions of the Conciabulum of Cordova (852). In the tenth century the condition of the Christians again became tolerable. The division of the caliphate into several emirates (1031) was favorable to the Christians, who had already regained some portions of Spain from the Moors (Mauri). In the year 1085 Toledo fell into their hands.

Under the guidance of the celebrated Cid, Cumpeador (Roderic Diaz, Count of Vivar, + 1099), the Christian Spaniards conquered Valencia (1094). The victory near Las Novas de Toledo (1212) reduced Cordova to submission. Now Granada alone remained in subjection to the Moors; and this was reconquered in 1492 by Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile, his wife, at the head of the Christian forces.

The victors granted their civil privileges and freedom of worship to those Moors who remained in the country; but, also solicitous to impart to them the blessings of Christianity, they had missions held among them. These were given under the direction of Ferdinand de Talavera, Archbishop of Granada, and Cardinal Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo. Many Moors were received into the Church; but it soon appeared that the greater part of these were Christians only in appearance, and still held fast to Islamism in their hearts. This, together with the repeated insurrections of the Moors and their conspiracies with the Mahometans of Africa, compelled the kings to withdraw their privileges, to place restrictions on them, and finally to banish them from Spain.

With regard to the persecution of the Jews of the Middle Ages, it is historically certain that they were not the result of ecclesiastical authority, but were the work partly of the mob, partly of the temporal rulers. This refutes the accusation that the motive of such persecution was religious fanaticism. On the contrary, history

bears witness that usury and other crimes had irritated the populace against the Jews; while on the other hand their wealth, or, as in Spain, their political standing, prompted many rulers to issue edicts of persecution.

In opposition to this conduct, which was, in point of fact, often pursued under the pretext of religion, St. Bernard and other eminent men, particularly the Popes,¹ protected them, and both by word and deed expressed disapprobation of persecuting them. In Rome and in the States of the Church the Jews were unmolested; and the many laws which, under pain of the severest ecclesiastical censure, forbade the maltreatment of Jews, the disturbance of their services, the desecration of their cemeteries, prove how earnestly the Popes were opposed to persecution; but at the same time the Popes and synods uttered warnings and made special regulations against all dangerous intercourse with the Jews.

The Popes likewise held in abhorrence and prohibited every attempt to force conversion on the Jews, desiring that they should enter the Church only from inward conviction. Very few Jews became sincere converts. The greater part of this blinded people still kept the veil before their hearts; and neither the apologetico-polemical writings of the scholastics nor the frequent conferences held between Christian and Jewish scholars have been able to remove it.

¹ Compare the Constitution of Innocent III. The "great Pope" expresses himself thus: *Licet perfidia Judaeorum sit multipliciter improbanda, quia tamen per eos fides nostra veraciter comprobatur, non sunt a fidelibus graviter opprimendi. . . . Nos ergo, licet in sua magis velint duritiae perdurare quam vaticinia Prophetarum et legis arcana cognoscere atque ad Christianae fidei notitiam pervenire, quia tamen nostrae postulant defensionis auxilium, ex Christianae pietatis mansuetudine, praedecessorum nostrorum fel. mem. Calixti, Eugenii, Alexandri, Clementis, Coelestini* (who had all taken part with the Jews), *Rom. Pontif. vestigiis inhaerentes . . . statuimus, ut nullus Christianus invitox vel nolentes eos ad baptismum per violentiam pervenire compellat. . . . Nullus etiam Chr. sine potestatis terrae judicio personas eorum nequiter laedere vel res eorum violenter afferre praesumat, aut bonas, quas hactenus in ea, in qua habitant regione, habuerint, consuetudines immutare. Praeterea in festivitatum suarum celebratione quisquam fustibus vel lapidibus eos ulla tenus non perturbet, nec aliquis ab eis indebita servitia exigere vel extorquere contendat, nisi ea quae ipsi praeteritis facere temporibus consueverunt. Ad haec, malorum hominum pravitati et avaritiae obviantes decernimus, ut nemo coemeterium Judaeorum mutilare audeat vel minuere, sive obtentu pecuniae corpora effodere jam humata. Si quis autem decreti hujus tenore cognito temere, quod absit, contraire tentaverit . . . excommunicationis ultione plectatur.* (Registr. lib. ii. Ep. 302.) Cf. *Rom. xi. 28.*

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

1. TO THE PONTIFICATE OF BONIFACE VIII., INCLUSIVE (1303).

§ 114. *Struggles of the Popes for the Liberty of the Church.*—
Gregory VII.—*Renewal of the Laws against Simony and Concubinage.*—*Contest concerning Investitures.*

AFTER the death of Alexander II. (1073), Cardinal Hildebrand,¹ with the consent of King Henry IV., ascended the papal throne, to which he had been called by the unanimous voice of the clergy and the people. He took the name, which he rendered so illustrious, of Gregory VII.

The new Pope continued the gigantic struggle against simony and concubinage, in which he had taken an active part in past years. Once seated on the papal throne, he was more stringent than his predecessors had been to set the Church free from these evils, the desolating effects of which he had had a better opportunity than others of knowing.

Already, at his first Lenten Synod² (1074), Gregory had renewed the ancient laws of the Church on the conduct of the clergy, had deposed such of these as had acquired their benefice by simony or were living in concubinage, and had forbidden them to perform spiritual functions; he had also prohibited the laity from asking or receiving ecclesiastical ministrations at the hands of such as these.

The carrying out of these decrees of the synod, which were published in every direction by legates appointed for the purpose by Gregory, naturally met with great opposition from that part of the clergy and those princes who had hitherto derived great advantages from simony. In many places stormy scenes occurred. But neither the clamor of unworthy priests, the reports and remonstrances of cowardly bishops, nor the opposition of the secular power, could deter the resolute pontiff from his purpose; for that purpose had been inspired by the love of God and anxiety for the welfare of the Church. With the persistency of an iron will he pursued his lofty aim, and was sustained in his reformatory efforts by the better part of the clergy, of the people, and their princes.

¹ For the conduct of Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII., see the most valuable work of Cardinal Hergenröther, "Catholic Church and Christian State."

² *Harduin*, vi. 1, 1551 sqq.

Gregory came to the best understanding with King William the Conqueror of England.¹ The ecclesiastical laws also gained the victory over the excited passions in Spain. But so much the more vehement was the opposition raised in upper Italy and France, and especially in Germany, whose dissolute king, Henry IV., under the influence of evil counsellors and immoral women, made a trade of selling Church benefices or of presenting them to his favorites. To this king the Pope addressed a letter of friendly remonstrance, advising him to dismiss such of his counsellors as had been already excommunicated by Alexander II., to amend his own life, and to observe the ecclesiastical laws. Henry, being at this time hard pressed by the Saxons, returned a friendly answer; yet in spite of the promises he had therein given to the Pope, he kept the excommunicated persons at his court, and continued to confer ecclesiastical dignities on persons utterly unworthy of them. Under these circumstances a conflict was inevitable. It broke out in the following year. In order to lay the axe at the root of the evil, Gregory, in 1075, forbade investiture by laymen, which had been the proximate occasion of the pernicious vice of simony.²

This decree, which was not intended to shut out the temporal rulers from all participation in the nomination of bishops and abbots, but only to put an end to a crying abuse, called forth a vehement opposition. King Henry did not trouble himself at all about the papal prohibition; and the Saxons, whom he had conquered and held in slavish subjection, appealed to the Pope for aid. On both these counts Gregory addressed earnest representations to the king. Henry, elated by his victory over the Saxons on the Unstrut, complied with none of the papal injunctions, but drove the legates out of the country; finally, he was summoned to Rome to render an account of his conduct.

At a conciabulum at Worms (1076), he had "the false monk Hildebrand" deposed. The same was done at Piacenza, at the same instigation.

¹ Cf. Conc. Rotomag. (1074) ap. *Harduin*, vi. 1, col. 1518 sqq. How much the Pope was inclined to peace is obvious from his letter to Bishop Hugh of Die (Registr. ix. Ep. 5): *Rex Anglorum licet in quibusdam non ita religiose sicut optamus se habeat; tamen in hoc quod ecclesias Dei non destruit neque vendit, et pacem justitiamque in subditis suis moderari procurat; et quia contra Apostolicam sedem, rogatus a quibusdam inimicis crucis Christi pactum inire, consentire noluit; presbyteros uxores, laicos decimus quas detinebant, etiam juramento dimittere compulit; ceteris regibus se satis probabiliorem ac magis honorandum ostendit.*

² Cf. Ep. *Greg.* ad *Henr.* (Registr. iii. Ep. 10).

Gregory, who had been rescued by the Romans from the power of the conspirator Cencius, now resolved upon severer measures. At the Lenten Synod (1076), at which the shameless cleric Roland had the insolence to promulgate the decree of Worms, sentence of excommunication¹ was pronounced on the king, in the presence of the faithful Empress Agnes, and with the consent of the one hundred and ten bishops there assembled; at the same time Henry's subjects were released from their oath of fealty.² And yet a formal deposition of the king lay so little in the designs of the Pope that when the princes of the empire, dissatisfied with Henry, assembled at Tribur in that self-same year, it was precisely Gregory who, through his legates, prevailed on them not to elect a new king, but to grant to the excommunicated monarch a period of twelve months³ in which to reconcile himself to the Church; the final decision to be resolved on, at the Diet of Augsburg, the following year.

This action of the princes broke down the self-confident haughtiness of the king. In an exceptionally cold winter Henry, clad in a penitential garb, went to Canossa, to a castle belonging to the Marchioness Matilda of Tuscany, where Gregory was then staying, and petitioned to be absolved from the ban of excommunication. After a three days' penance this was granted to him on the 28th of January, 1077.

This peace, however, was of short duration. The king disregarded his oath, and even united with the Lombard barons who had fallen out with the Pope. Then the German princes assembled at Forchheim declared Henry deposed, and elected Rudolph, Duke of Suabia, in his place; and this they did in spite of the remonstrances of the Pope, to whom the final decision had been reserved (March, 1077).

A fearful civil war now broke out in Germany. Gregory, to whom both competitors for the throne sent ambassadors, decided in favor of neither, but desired the convocation of a diet, that the claims of the rivals might be adjusted by the mutual assent of the temporal and spiritual princes. But the negotiations for this purpose dragged wearily along; the promised diet did not convene, and the civil war

¹ A necessary result of excommunication was the loss of the power of reigning, since no faithful Christian could hold intercourse with an excommunicated person.

² Totius regni Thentonicorum et Italiae gubernacula contradico et omnes Christianos a vinculo juramenti, quod sibi fecerunt vel facient, absolvo, et ut nullus ei serviat sicut regi interdico. *Hergenröther*, Catholic Church and Christian State, p. 50 sqq.

³ *Paul. Berlr. c. 85*: Juxta legem Tentonicorum se praediis et beneficiis privandos esse non dubitabant, si sub excommunicatione integrum annum permanerent.

continued to rage. Although overwhelmed with reproaches by Rudolph's ambassadors, the Pope persisted in his previous decision, and in 1079 sent an embassy to Germany. But even these were not able to restore peace, for Henry's adherents frustrated all the efforts of the legates.

Henry still continued to force his creatures into the German bishoprics, and after the battle of Flarchheim (1080), had the inconceivable effrontery to ask of the Pope, through his legates, the excommunication of Rudolph, threatening that an anti-Pope should be appointed in case his demand were refused.¹

For these causes Gregory, at the Roman Synod, March 7, 1080, renewed the sentence of excommunication against Henry, deposed him from his dignity, and acknowledged Rudolph of Suabia as king of the Germans.

Then Henry summoned his adherents, nineteen bishops, to Mentz; and first at this place and afterwards at Brixen, to which place the Lombard bishops also came, in this assembly, who were for the most part composed of deposed and excommunicated simonists, sentence of deposition was pronounced against Gregory, and Guibert, the excommunicated Archbishop of Ravenna, was elected in his stead, under the style and title of Clement III. After the battle near the Elster, at which Rudolph was mortally wounded, Henry had his anti-Pope recognized at the Conciliabulum of Piacenza, Oct. 15, 1080, and intended to have him enthroned at Rome.

Henry, whose anti-Pope devastated the States of the Church, was compelled in the mean time twice to give up the siege of Rome. On coming thither the third time, he succeeded in taking possession of a part of the city. He then renewed his attempts to win over the Pope to his side, even declaring his willingness to relinquish his anti-Pope. Gregory was not again to be deceived by empty promises, but required, as a condition for receiving the perfidious king into the Church, that he should perform real penance; and, at a synod attended only by the bishops of lower Italy, he renewed the sentence of excommunication against all the enemies of the Church.

In the spring of 1084 the excommunicated king obtained by bribery possession of Rome. The Pope had withdrawn to the castle of St. Angelo. Henry now, in a so-called synod, had him excommunicated and deposed, and Guibert installed as Clement III. in St. Peter's Church at the festival of Easter. From this latter Henry received the imperial crown.

¹ *Bonizo*, l. c. ix. (*Migne*, l. c. tom. cl. col. 848)

Gregory's condition became worse every day. The forts of his adherents were for the most part destroyed by the royal troops, who were now preparing to take the castle of St. Angelo by storm. At this critical moment Robert Guiscard, the powerful Duke of Normandy, came to the rescue. He indeed set the Pope free; but, unfortunately, he devastated the city, and Gregory, whom no pressure of exterior circumstances affecting his own position could discourage, was thrown into great affliction at witnessing the misery of the Roman people, which he could not prevent, but which he had no hand in causing. After renewing the excommunication on Henry, the Pope and his followers went to Monte Casino, and thence to Salerno, where, on May 25, 1085, he ended his holy life, in great tribulation indeed, yet with the joyful confidence of not having struggled and suffered in vain.

The last words of Gregory, "Dilexi justitiam et odivi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio," form the most beautiful and fitting epitaph for the man who aspired neither to a universal monarchy nor to a universal theocracy, but whose sole desire was to banish the spirit of the world from the Church, that he might bring back the spirit of Jesus Christ again to rule in the world.

I. The relation of the spiritual to the temporal power is expressed by Gregory VII. in a letter to William the Conqueror, of England, in these words:¹ "Credimus prudentiam vestram non latere, omnibus aliis excellentiores Apostolicam et regiam dignitates huic mundo ad ejus regimina omnipotentem Deum distribuisse. Sicut enim ad mundi pulchritudinem oculis carneis diversis temporibus representandam, solem et lunam omnibus aliis eminentiora dispositis luminaria; sic, ne creatura, quam sui benignitas ad imaginem suam in hoc mundo creaverat, in erronea et mortifera traheretur pericula, providit, ut Apostolica et regia dignitate per diversa regeretur officia. Qua tamen majoritatis et minoritatis distantia religio sic se movet Christiana, ut eura et dispensatione Apostolicae dignitatis post Deum gubernetur regia."²

1. From this it is obvious that the Pope is far from considering all princes to be his vassals; if he claims fealty from some kingdoms, this claim rests on some peculiar legal title.³

The clause in the formula of oath administered to Rudolph,

¹ Registr. vii. Ep. 25.

² Cf. I. Ep. 19.

³ See *Bianchi*, *Della potestà e della politia della chiesa*, tom. i. lib. i. § 13 sqq. *Hergenröther*, *Catholic Church and Christian State*.

“miles Sancti Petri et illius [of the Pope] efficiar,” does not prove the contrary of this, because “miles” does not here mean “vassal,” but “defender.” Gregory also authorized Bishop Altman of Passau, to whom he sent the formula, to alter or amend it by diminishing or increasing it, if he saw fit to do so.¹ From the words of the Pope, “Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolfo,” nothing can be inferred, because their genuineness is more than doubtful. When Gregory asks King William the Conqueror “fidelitatem facere,” it cannot be inferred that he considered the monarch his vassal.²

2. On the other hand, the Pope requires from all princes and nations subjection to the spiritual authority of the Church and to her supreme ruler; and especially were they required to recognize the Lordship of Christ (“imperium Christi”), and consider the Church not as a “maid-servant,” but as superioress and mistress (“praelatam Dominam”).³ The superiority of the Church in regard to the temporal power is also laid down in the so-called “Dictatus Papae,”⁴ the genuineness of which is controverted.

II. In many of his letters Gregory VII. expresses with great clearness the fundamental thoughts of his soul, and the object of his every exertion. In his circular to all the faithful⁵ he says: “Unum volumus, videlicet ut omnes impii resipiscant, et ad creatorem suum revertantur. Unum desideramus, scilicet ut sancta ecclesia, per totum orbem conculta et confusa, et per diversas partes discissa, ad pristinum decorum et soliditatem redeat. Ad unum tendimus, quia, ut Deus glorificetur in nobis, et nos cum fratribus nostris, etiam cum his qui nos persecuntur, ad vitam aeternam pervenire mereamur exoptamus.”

III. The assertion that Gregory taught that the temporal power had its origin and foundation in evil, is contradicted by his express declaration that the temporal power also proceeds from God.⁶ There are, it is true, in some writings of the Pope, passages like this: “Quis nesciat reges et duces ab iis habuisse *principium*, qui, Deum ignorantes, superbia, rapinis, perfidia, homicidiis, postremo universis pene sceleribus, mundi principe diabolo videlicet agitante, super pares,

¹ “De his si quid minuendum vel augendum censueris,” etc., ix. 3. *Harduin*, l. c. 1481.

² *Bianchi*, l. c. § 13, n. 6, p. 345.

³ *Registr. iii. Ep. 10*; *iv. Ep. 3*.

⁴ *Harduin*, l. c. 1304. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. clxviii. col. 407.

⁵ *Registr. ix. Ep. 21*.

⁶ Cf. *Registr. ii. Ep. 31* ad Henric.: *Quem Deus in summo rerum posuit eum mine, etc.*

sel. homines, dominari eaeca cupiditate et intolerabili praesumptione affectarunt?"¹ But apart from the fact that the Pope here gives no doctrine, but only asserts an historical event, there is a great difference between the two sentences that "kings and dukes derived their power from those that," etc., and that "the temporal power has its origin in evil." This latter proposition Gregory never asserted, but rather the contrary.²

IV. The scene at Canossa was neither an act of great severity, nor did the "splendor of the empire" pale before it, as Giesebricht thinks.³ Henry and his companions did not stand three days and nights without shelter and without food, clad only in a shirt, and trembling with cold: they were clad in the penitential garb, which might be worn over the other clothing; they stood there, "a mane usque ad vesperam,"⁴ but during the night remained at the inn, where they took food and drink. Nor is there any dishonor in doing penance of one's own free-will; at least, there was none during the Middle Ages. Emperor Henry III., King Henry of England, and others took like penances upon themselves. For the rest, one can but admire the fortitude of the Pope, who, stripped as he was of the external power of arms, persevered in vindicating the liberty and purity of the bride of Christ against the impetuous encroachments of a vicious and faithless ruler.

If the "splendor of the imperial dignity" grew pale under Henry IV., who, after all, was not at that time emperor, it was certainly not by the penance undertaken and performed by the king, but by the outrages and deeds of shame that brought him to Canossa, as also by the faithlessness with which he broke the promises made on oath to the Pope.

It speaks highly for Gregory that the best, the noblest, and the ablest men of his own times, as of those which succeeded him, were entirely on his side. Anselm of Canterbury, Gebhard of Salzburg, Altmann of Passau, Bruno of Merseburg, Lambert of Hersfeld, the bishops Bonizo of Sutri and Anselm the younger of Lucca, Matilda of Tuscany, and even Henry's mother, the Empress Agnes, with several cardinals and many others, all sided with the Pope.

¹ Registr. vii. Ep. 21 ad *Heriman.* episcop. Metens.

² Compare *Bianchi*, Della potestà e della politia della chiesa, tom. i. lib. i. § 10, p. 273 sqq.

³ Hist. of Emperors, iii. 403.

⁴ *Lamb.* ap. *Pertz*, vii. 259.

§ 115. *Continuation of the Struggle.—Successors of Gregory VII.
—Concordat of Worms.*

The successors of Gregory VII. acted in his spirit, though not always with his energy. Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino, Victor III. (1086-1087), forbade, at the Council of Benevent, all investiture by laymen, which he denominated "scelus idolatriae," and those invested he termed "infideles."¹ His successor, Otho, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Urban II. (1088-1099), renewed the laws against this abuse, and for very important reasons added, at the Synod of Clermont, a prohibition against taking the oath of fealty, or the "homagium."² At the same synod the adulterous King Philip of France was excommunicated, and the first crusade was decided upon.³ The position of affairs in England compelled the Pope to act against William II.⁴ In Italy the flames of rebellion were blazing fiercely. Upper Italy was in the power of the anti-Pope, who contended with the lawful Pope even for the possession of Rome. Matilda of Tuscany alone remained loyal to Urban, and offered a strong and persistent resistance to Henry, who still persevered in his opposition to the Apostolic See.

The good services of Roger I., Count of Normandy, who expelled the Saracens from Sicily, were rewarded by the Pope, by conferring on him a peculiar privilege.⁵ It was not till his life was drawing

¹ *Harduin*, vi. 2, col. 1626.

² Can. 17 : Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligiam fidelitatem faciat.

³ *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, iv. 195.

⁴ See § 118.

⁵ What Urban II. conceded to Count Roger I. is seen from the *Privilegium of Paschalii II.* to Roger II., wherein it is stated : Antecessor meus patri tuo legati vicem gratuitate concessit ; nos quoque tibi post ipsum ejus successorii concessimus, ea videlicet ratione, ut si quando illuc ex latere nostro legatus *dirigitur*, quem profecto vicarium intellegimus *quae ab eo gerenda sunt*, per tuam industriam *effectui* mancipentur. (*Jaffi*, *Regest. Rom. pontif. n. 4846.*) In this the Pope neither conferred on the Count the right of a legate, nor did he make to him or his posterity a concession that was to be hereditary. The Sicilian rulers, however, who extorted many rights from the Popes during the Middle Ages (compare § 117), laid claim to the dignity and rights of an apostolic legate, which they traced to the time of Ferdinand I. the Catholic, from what passed for a bull of Urban II., then first found, and extended their legate rights (*Monarchia Sicula*) from the time of the sixteenth century in such a manner as to destroy the freedom of the Sicilian Church and to take away the power of jurisdiction from the Pope. When repeated protestations from the Roman See had no effect, Clement XI., by the bull "Romanus pontifex" (1714 resp. 1715), withdrew the usurped legate-right, together with the established "Tribunal of Monarchy," and gave special directions respecting the course to be taken in Church affairs. Finally, Pius IX., by the bull *Suprema* (1864 resp. 1867), confirmed the action of Clement XI.

to its close that the Pope, who had given the impetus to the first crusade, came into possession of Rome, where he died in 1099.

Urban was succeeded by Cardinal Rainer, formerly a monk at Clugny, who took the name of Paschal II. (1099–1118). The anti-Pope died in 1100. Henry IV., against whom his own son Conrad had revolted, had now the opportunity afforded him of being reconciled to the Church; but the blinded king did not avail himself of it: so far from it, he set up three anti-Popes one after the other. At length the hour of retribution struck. Henry, in 1105, was compelled to resign in favor of his son Henry V. But the struggle was not therefore at an end. The king repeatedly demanded the right of appointing bishops, which the Pope firmly refused. After a series of negotiations which proved fruitless, a way was at length found to smooth over difficulties. Paschal concluded with Henry, who had come into Italy with a large army, the Treaty of Sutri (1111), by which the Apostolic See resigned the fiefs and regalia of the bishops and abbots, and the king renounced the right of investiture.

But the carrying out of the terms of this treaty proved to be impossible. The bishops protested against surrendering to the king the fiefs of the empire; and the royal counsellors, against relinquishing the right of investiture. Henry V. with his followers entered the church of St. Peter, which then became the scene of disgusting acts; for when Paschal refused to crown Henry emperor, the king ordered him and a number of the cardinals to be taken prisoners and carried away. He then extorted from him a so-called “privilegium,” by which the work of Gregory VII. was again destroyed; for Paschal granted to the king the imperial crown, with the right of investiture and of deciding contested elections. He promised, moreover, not to excommunicate him for what had happened;¹ while Henry, on his part, set the Pope and cardinals free, and promised to protect the Apostolic See and to make restitution of the stolen possessions of the Church. Then the king and Pope returned to Rome on the 13th of April, 1111, where the imperial coronation took place.

This “privilegium” met with a vehement opposition. The Lateran Synod of March 18, 1112, condemned it unanimously, and called upon the emperor to relinquish it. But this he would not do; and the Synod of Vienne and some other synods excommunicated the emperor, while the Pope himself took no decisive step against

¹ When granting the privilege, the Pope exclaimed: *Cogor pro ecclesiae pace et liberatione id perpeti, quod ne paterer, vitam quoque cum sanguine profundere paratus eram.* (*Watterich*, ii. 66.)

him. In the mean time a party had arisen in Germany itself against the emperor and his arbitrary government. He took up arms, but was defeated in 1115, and excommunicated by the bishops who, at the call of Adalbert, Archbishop of Mentz, convened at Cologne.

In the same year Matilda, Margravine of Tuscany, the zealous defender of the Church, died, having willed her goods and possessions to the Apostolic See. This bequest led to new disturbances between the Pope and the emperor. Henry claimed not only the fiefs of the empire, but also the freeholds of the margravine, and of his own assumption of power appointed a governor for Tuscany. For this he was excommunicated at the Lateran Synod in 1116. In the following year Henry appeared with an army before the walls of Rome. Paschal now left the unquiet city, the fickle-minded inhabitants of which joyfully received the emperor. At the Easter festival there was a repetition of the coronation celebration. The suspended Archbishop of Bracara, Mauritius Burdinus, placed the crown on Henry's head.

When Henry had withdrawn from Rome, Paschal returned to the city, but died shortly after. He had been obliged to defend the rights of the Church in France and in England.¹ He was succeeded by the Chancellor of the Roman Church, Cardinal John of Gaeta (Gelasius II.). This Pope was maltreated by the imperial party, at whose head was Cencius Fraugipani, and then driven from the city by the troops of Henry, with whose unreasonable demands he could not comply. Henry then had the excommunicated Mauritius Burdinus crowned as Gregory VIII., — the anti-Pope.

Gelasius, who had at Capua excommunicated the emperor and his creatures, died at Clugny in 1119. He was succeeded by the energetic Guido of Vienne, Calixtus II. (1119–1124), against whom Burdinus could not hold out. Under this Pope the contest, which had now lasted fifty years and had done so much harm, was at length peaceably adjusted. Pope and emperor, after lengthened negotiations, concluded the Calixtine Concordat, or Concordat of Worms.² Henry resigned the right of investiture by ring and crosier, and promised restitution of the possessions of which he had robbed the Roman or other churches. The Pope, on the other hand, conceded to the emperor the right to send deputies to the election of German bishops, and of investing bishops with the

¹ See § 118.

² *Nussi, Conventiones de rebus eccl. inter s. sedem et civil. potestatem.* Mogunt. 1870, pp. 1, 2.

regalia by means of the imperial sceptre. In the case of Germans this might take place before their consecration, but Burgundians and Italians were to receive the same after they had been consecrated bishops. Concerning the "homagium" nothing was finally settled. This concordat was the first concluded between the Apostolic See and the State; it received confirmation¹ at

THE NINTH ECUMENICAL SYNOD IN THE LATERAN, 1123
(LATERAN I.).

It put an end indeed to the strife concerning the investitures, but was far from doing so in regard to all the encroachments of the temporal power. The Popes had often to take under their protection the canonical election of the prelates.

§ 116. *Double Elections.—Disturbances at Rome.*

After the death of Calixtus II. the freedom of papal elections was seriously threatened by some noble families, particularly those of the Frangipani and of the Pierleoni,² who imitated the example of the earlier counts of Tusculum, and of the Crescentians in the tenth century.

The first double election passed without great disturbance. Cardinal Theobald (Celestine) II. resigned of his own free-will, on which his opponent, Lambert of Ostia, was re-elected, and ascended the papal throne as Honorius II. (1124-1130).³ During his pontificate the election of Lothaire, Duke of Saxony, as German king, took place. The new king was faithfully devoted to the Church, and abolished the objectionable part of the Calixtine Concordat, and promised to bestow the investiture on the consecrated bishops without exacting the "homagium."

During the reign of Honorius II. the workings of party spirit still made themselves felt, and even influenced the college of cardinals. A number of them elected Innocent II. (1130-1143); the other cardinals gave their suffrages to their colleague, Petrus Leoni (Anacletus II.). The latter maintained his claim in Rome, and also won over Roger of Sicily to his side.

Innocent II., however, was recognized as Pope at various synods in France, England, and Germany, and finally, in 1133, was by Lothaire, whose help he had invoked in Liege, conducted in triumph to

¹ *Harduin*, tom. vi. 2. *Mansi*, tom. xxi.

² A rich Jewish family, which had become Christian.

³ *Watterich*, ii. 157 sqq. *Migne*, tom. clxvi.

Rome. Here the king received the imperial crown. He also received some portions of the "allodia," or freehold, of the Margravine Matilda, holding them as a vassal of the Pope.

After the departure of the emperor, Innocent was again obliged to leave the Eternal City. He went to Pisa, where he held a synod (1135), and in 1137 returned to Rome, under the protection of Lothaire. The pseudo-Pope died Jan. 25, 1138. His successor, Victor IV., with his adherents, of their own free-will, submitted to the lawful Pope. This ended the schism; and in the spring of 1139, at

THE TENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN (LATERAN II.),

the "Peace of the Church" was solemnly proclaimed. The assembled bishops and abbots, to the number of about a thousand, pronounced sentence of excommunication against Roger of Sicily; deposed those dignitaries who had been raised to office by Anacletus; renewed the earlier canons against simony, concubinage, and the like; and forbade the fanatical demagogue, Arnold of Brescia, to stir up the people by his sermons. The peace of the Church was in this manner restored; but it was not so with the peace in Rome, the inhabitants of which, whose heads were turned by romantic notions of republicanism, formally renounced obedience to the Pope (1143). At that time the revolutionary movement proceeded from the popular party, including the lower nobility, whereas the higher nobility kept themselves quiet. The example of the cities of upper Italy, which, in the struggles between Pope and emperor, had managed to secure for themselves a position of great political independence, was too enticing to the eccentric Romans for them not to try to imitate it.

Already, under Innocent, the Romans had chosen a new senate. Pope Celestine II. died about five months after his election. Under his successor, Lucius II., the unquiet people chose a patrician, to whom they desired the highest rights of the Pope to be given. The Pope appealed for help to King Conrad III.; but he was too busy with his own country, and Lucius, while endeavoring to take possession of the capital, met his death (February 15).

His successor, Eugene III. (1145-1153), could only go back from Viterbo to Rome at the end of the year 1145; but after a short time new conflicts broke out between him and his rebellious subjects. Eugene went to France, where he held several synods, while Arnold of Brescia nourished the fire of revolt in Rome. To the pompous letter of the Romans to Conrad III., inviting him to take up his residence in the city, the king deigned no answer; and at

length senate and people reconciled themselves with Eugene, who had found an ally in Roger of Sicily. But the peace did not last long; and the Pope was again obliged to leave Rome, to which he did not return till the year 1152.

The chief credit for the restoration of peace and order in Italy and in the States of the Church is due to St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux. He also gives to his former disciple, Eugene III., in his five books, "De consideratione," a beautiful instruction on fulfilling the grave duties of a Pope, points out with great frankness the abuses actually in existence, and draws with great force and ability a picture of the morals of the times.

The Treaty of Constance, concluded during the pontificate of Eugene between himself and the Emperor Frederic, the successor of Conrad (1153), was a very important event, the concluding of which is due to the efforts of the learned statesman Wibald, Abbot of Stablo and Corvey. He had already taken an active part in political affairs under Lothaire III., and even a greater part under Conrad III. Under Frederic I. he obtained an influential political position, in which he, though unable to prevent all encroachments on the part of the king upon ecclesiastical prerogatives, was yet enabled to prevent the outbreak of greater and more vehement conflicts.

Eugene died in the year 1153, and had to leave the ratification of the Treaty of Constance¹ to his successor, Anastasius IV. (+ 1154).

§ 117. *Contests of the Apostolic See with the Cæsarian Papism of the Hohenstaufens.—Popes Adrian and Alexander III. in Conflict with Frederic I.*

Shortly after the termination of the conflict concerning investitures, the Apostolic See was compelled to engage in a far more critical contest with the Cæsarian Papism of the Hohenstaufens.

¹ Watterich, ii. 319. Frederic promised, in this treaty, that he would conclude no peace with the Romans or with Roger of Sicily without the consent of the Pope; that he would compel the Roman people to acknowledge the dominion of the Pope as they had done one hundred years previously; that he would defend the honor and regalia of St. Peter, as a special protector of the Roman Church; that he would procure the restoration of the possessions lost by the Church, and not permit the Greeks to hold any territory in Italy. The Pope promised to honor the king as the cherished son of St. Peter, to crown him emperor, to support him in upholding and increasing the honor of the empire,—in case of necessity to excommunicate any one who would hinder him in this,—and to resist the Greeks should they invade Italy.

It began with the accession of Frederic Barbarossa to the royal throne.

Notwithstanding his many high and distinguished qualifications, Frederic lacked true reverence for the Church and due respect for the well-obtained rights of others. His project of restoring the imperial authority in Germany and Italy was wholly justifiable; but Frederic was too absolute in his conception of what really constituted imperial power, and far too despotic in carrying out his ideal. An energetic resistance from both worldly and spiritual princes was therefore to be expected; in fact, it was inevitable, especially on the part of the Apostolic See.

After adjusting the most urgent of the affairs in Germany, Frederic went with an army to Italy, received the crown of Lombardy at Pavia, and drew near to Rome. Adrian IV. (Nicholas Breakspeare, 1154-1159, the only English Pope), being alarmed, left the city, having first brought the restless inhabitants to their senses by an interdict; but having received friendly assurances from Henry, through his ambassadors, he consented to meet the king at Sutri. The refusal of the haughty Hohenstaufen to hold the Pope's stirrup, according to a usage sanctioned by the laws of the empire, increased the mistrust of Adrian, who saw in this omission an act of symbolical meaning which but too plainly betrayed his disposition towards the supreme head of the Church. Finally, however, the king performed this act of service to the Pope; and having committed the rebellious Arnold to the prefects of the city, and rejected the proposals of the haughty Romans to receive at their hands the imperial dignity, Frederic was crowned emperor by the Pope, after which he went back to Germany.

The party conflicts immediately after the coronation were but a prelude to greater contentions. The relations of the emperor to the Pope became daily more and more unfriendly. Frederic was enraged with Adrian because the latter, yielding to force, had absolved King William of Sicily from excommunication, and invested him with Sicily and Apulia; while the Pope, on the other hand, could no longer tolerate the violations of the Calixtine Concordat by the emperor, and felt obliged to make earnest remonstrances. The plundering and imprisonment of Eskyl, Archbishop of Lund (Sweden), which the emperor suffered to go unpunished, offered him an occasion for such a remonstrance. When the papal letter was read at the Diet of Besançon (1157), the words "sed si majora beneficia excellentia tua de manu nostra suscepisset" exasperated the princes

to a great degree, because the Chancellor Reinald von Dassel translated "beneficia" with fiefs or feudal tenure, as if the emperor were a vassal of the Pope; and their wrath rose to its highest pitch when the Cardinal Legate Roland asked the question, quite justifiable in this place, "From whom, then, did the king receive the empire?" This gave rise to a tumultuous uproar. The lives of the legates were endangered; they had to leave Germany on the following day.

An imperial circular letter was written to influence the princes, and to prepare them for an eventual conflict, which was hindered from breaking out by the dignified conduct of Adrian. Through his legates he sent another letter to the emperor, in Augsburg, in which he explained that by the word "beneficia" he by no means intended to insinuate "vassalage." Peace was thus again restored. But it was of short duration. The absolute imperialism of Frederic and the autonomy of the Church were incompatible, so that collision was inevitable.

After Frederic, in his second expedition into Italy, had curbed the insolence of the cities of upper Italy, he held a diet in the plain of Roncaglia, and summoned four jurists from Bologna to set forth and defend the imperial rights. In doing this these jurists insisted on the views of the ancient Roman period, without any regard to the developments that had since taken place, or any reference to the existing state of affairs, so that the cities and the bishops lost the rights they had won by their strenuous exertions, in the course of time. The officers of the emperor carried these views of imperial rights into effect, using great harshness; and, added to this, the emperor, notwithstanding the treaty between Pope Innocent and Lothaire, took possession of Matilda's inheritance, demanded the Fodrum (provision for man and beast, — corn, hay, etc.) from the inhabitants of the States of the Church, and stretched his rights as feudal lord even to Rome and the papal territory. It was in vain that the Pope warned the emperor.¹ Frederic, who of his own authority inducted

¹ The Pope writes, among other things: In litteris ad nos missis nomen tuum nostro praeponis: in quo insolentiae, ne dicam arrogantiae, notam incurris. Quid dicam de fidelitate beato Petri et nobis a te promissa et jurata, quomodo eam observes, qui ab his, qui Dei sunt et filii excelsi omnes, episcopis scilicet, hominum requiris, fidelitatem exigis, manus eorum consecratas manibus tuis innectis et manifeste factus nobis contrarius, cardinalibus a latere nostro directis non solum ecclesias, sed etiam civitates regni tui clandis? Resipisce igitur resipisci, tibi consulimus, quia dum a nobis consecrationem et coronam merneris, dum inconcessa captas, ne concessa perdas, tuae nobilitati timemus. (Watterich, ii. 373.)

his chancellor, Reinald, into the Archbishopric of Cologne, and Guido of Blanderade into the Archbishopric of Ravenna, answered the remonstrance with a contemptuous disregard even of the ordinary courtesies of life, in the letter which he sent to the Pope. Nor did the negotiations between the envoys on both sides lead to a favorable result. Hadrian could neither recognize the bishops invested by Frederic, nor comply with his other demands without violating the rights of the Church. The emperor became more and more unfriendly towards the Apostolic See, and even entered into relations with the rebellious Romans. Hadrian had already resolved on excommunicating Frederic, when death overtook him.

The "Chancellor Roland" was elected successor to Hadrian, as Alexander III.; only two cardinals devoted to the emperor made Cardinal Octavian (Victor IV.), Pope. Frederic seized the occasion to make good his rights as emperor. In order to adjust the contested (?) papal election, he convoked a so-called "concilium" to meet at Pavia (1160), and commanded the two elected "in the name of God and of the Catholic Church" to appear there. He even ordered the kings of France and England to send their bishops to Pavia. These, however, did not appear; and at the most only fifty bishops, of whom the greater part were German, took part in the conciliabulum. Alexander decidedly refused the invitation to appear at Pavia. On the other hand, the emperor's favorite, Octavian, was present, and received the homage of Frederic and the bishops as Pope. The "Chancellor Roland" was excommunicated.

Pope Alexander III. took up the gauntlet against so powerful an enemy with remarkable courage, and found many faithful allies in Christendom. After he had excommunicated the emperor in Agnani, he fled to France, while Frederic convened a new conciliabulum at Lodi (1161), in order to obtain recognition for his creature. But this did not succeed. The kings Louis VII. of France and Henry II. of England, and their bishops, as also some courageous prelates of Germany and the regular orders, remained faithful to Alexander; and his recognition became more and more general in spite of the various and insidious efforts of Frederic. The numerously attended Synod of Tours (1163) repeated the sentence of excommunication against Octavian, who in 1162 had held a so-called Synod of Treves.

The pseudo-Pope died at Lucca, 1164. But the hope that Frederic would now seek for reconciliation with the Church was not realized. At the Diet of Würzburg, 1165, he, at the instigation of Reinald, exerted himself in favor of the anti-Pope (Guido von Crema), Paschal

III,¹ and convened an assembly at Würzburg in his favor. Thither came also ambassadors from Henry II. of England, who was at that time at strife with St. Thomas à Becket. The German prelates who refused obedience to the anti-Pope were severely punished. Frederic brought his favorite to Rome, and had him enthroned as Pope in St. Peter's Church, which the Germans had desecrated with fire and blood. Alexander excommunicated the persecutor of the Church, and fled to Benevento. The Romans paid homage to the emperor, save the nobility, who remained loyal to the Pope.

But not for long was the excommunicated prince able to enjoy his victory. A fearful plague destroyed the greater part of his army. Even Reinald and his other counsellors succumbed to the contagion. The haughty Hohenstaufen, whose dismembered army could do nothing against the Lombard League, was compelled to escape as a fugitive into Germany.

In spite of these divine chastisements, Frederic would not listen to any terms of reconciliation with the Apostolic See, but sided with the Abbot John of Struma (Calixtus III.), who had assumed the papal purple after Guido's death, as anti-Pope. Frederic persecuted the adherents of Alexander III. The latter, in self-defence, entered more closely than before into relations with the Lombard League (foundation of Alessandria), yet at the same time gave the emperor sufficient evidence of preserving a friendly disposition towards him, by rejecting the proposition of the Greek emperor, Emmanuel, who promised to reunite the two churches in case the Pope would confer upon him the title of Roman Emperor.

The defeat of Frederic at the battle of Legnano (1176) finally brought about the peace of Venice (1177). At the conclusion the Pope confirmed in their sees those bishops who had been appointed by Frederic during the schism. He then returned to Rome, and here held

THE ELEVENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (LATERAN III.), 1179,

at which three hundred bishops assembled.

The decree passed by this council concerning the valid election of the Pope is of special importance; it requires the vote of two thirds of the cardinals² ("ille Rom. Pontifex habeatur, qui a duabus parti-

¹ At Frederic's desire, Paschal III. canonized Charlemagne. In some dioceses of Germany his feast is celebrated. Under Pius IX. the "Congregatio rituum" conceded the celebration of his feast for Aix-la-Chapelle.

² Statuimus, ut si forte . . . inter cardinales de substituendo Pontifice non potuerit

bus fuerit electus et receptus," etc.) to constitute a true election. At this council the errors of the Albigenses¹ were condemned, and many enactments in matters of discipline renewed.

As early as August, 1178, John of Struma had submitted. The schismatical party had, however, named a new anti-Pope, Lando Sitino (Innocent III.). He after a short reign had to go into exile.

Some years after the celebration of the Eleventh Ecumenical Council, Alexander, who had also successfully defended the rights of the Church in England, closed his eventful career. He died on the 30th of August, 1181, and carried with him to the grave the fame of having been one of the greatest princes of the Church.

§ 118. *Conflicts with the Church in England under William II. and Henry II.—The Archbishops Anselm and Thomas à Becket.*²

The continual warfare in England had occasioned in that country a very serious disturbance of ecclesiastical affairs, which first took a change for the better under William the Conqueror. This rude and violent, but religious monarch conferred the Archbishopric of Canterbury upon the celebrated Lanfranc, filled the other episcopal sees without simony, and carried into effect the reformatory decrees of Gregory VII. in the land over which he ruled. But as time went on, he obtained a power over the interior affairs of the Church which, with a king less disposed to use it for the benefit of religion, might become of serious injury to the liberties of Churchmen.³

William II. (Rufus, 1087) did, in fact, thus misuse the power which his father had on the whole exercised for the benefit of the Church.⁴ He left sees and abbeys vacant, that he might draw their revenues himself; levied high taxes on Church property, and sold the ecclesiastical benefices to the highest bidder. A dangerous sickness brought the king to his senses (1093). He promised amendment, dismissed his bad adviser, Ralph Flambard, and conferred the Archbishopric of Canterbury upon St. Anselm, the excellent abbot of the monastery of Bec.⁵

concordia plena esse, et duabus partibus concordantibus tertia pars noluerit concordare . . . ille Rom. Pontifex habeatur, qui a duabus partibus fuerit electus et receptus, etc.

¹ See § 146. ² Life of St. Thomas à Becket, by J. Morris, S. J., 2d ed. 1885.

³ Lingard, Hist. of England.

⁴ Eadmer, Hist. novor. lib. i.

⁵ Anselm's principle, "Ecclesia regibus et principibus commendata ad tutelam, non data in haereditariam dominationem," forms a very striking contrast to the conduct of the king.

But with return of health, the passions of William also returned. It was in vain that Anselm endeavored to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of England; the king, whose avarice the archbishop could not satisfy, opposed all his reformatory endeavors. He even denounced as high-treason the intention of Anselm to travel to Rome in order to obtain the pallium from the Pope, because he had not yet acknowledged the Pope. The primate proved, at the Assembly of Rockingham (March 11, 1095), that obedience to the Pope is quite consistent with allegiance to the king,¹ and he also met with protection from the temporal barons, while the prelates left him in the lurch.

After this attempt of the king had failed, he desired to obtain the help of the Pope to remove the energetic archbishop from his position. With this view he sent an embassy to Rome, to acknowledge in his name Urban II. as Pope, and to bring back the pallium for the primate. Yet William II. failed in obtaining his true wish. Urban prized highly the saintly archbishop with whom all well-disposed persons sided; and the papal legate who had come with the returned embassy to England could not comply with the demand of the king that he should depose Anselm and confer the pallium on another newly elected archbishop; therefore, finally, Anselm obtained the pallium. As, however, William rendered the exercise of his functions very arduous, nay, almost impossible to the zealous archbishop, Anselm felt himself compelled to lay his cause directly before the Holy See, and, in spite of the royal menace, set out for Rome. Urban received his guest with great distinction; and Anselm gave a beautiful proof of his love to William, in the Council of Bari (1098), when he hindered him from being excommunicated, as many of the bishops desired.

William died in August, 1100. Under his brother Henry I., Anselm returned to England; but he soon after fell into conflict with the king, on account of investiture and "homagium," and although he had given the king many tokens of fidelity, he was compelled to leave

¹ *Eadmer*, l. c. ap. *Migne*, col. 382. After quoting Matt. xvi. 18 and Luke x. 16, Anselm continues: *Haec sicut principaliter beato Petro et in ipso caeteris apostolis dicta accipimus, ita principaliter vicario b. Petri et per ipsum caeteris episcopis, qui vices agint apostolorum eadem dicta tenemus: non cuiilibet imperatori, non alicui regi, non duei, non comiti. In quo tamen terrenis principibus subdi ac ministrare debeamus docet et instruit idem ipse magni consilii Angelus dicens: Reddite quae sunt Caesaris, etc.* (Matt. xxii. 21). *Haec verba, haec consilia Dei sunt. Haec approbo, haec suscipio, haec nulla ratione exibo . . . in his quae Dei sunt vicario b. Petri obedientiam, et in his quae terrenae domini mei regis dignitati jure competunt et fidele consilium et auxilium pro sensus mei capacitate impendam.*

the kingdom a second time. The Treaty of Bec (1106) was confirmed at London in 1107; and thus peace was restored. The king renounced the right to investiture, and permitted the free election of bishops and abbots; the Church allowed the prelates to take the oath of fealty to the king.

The contest was thus settled as far as the principle was concerned; but the pernicious practice continued all the same, through the reigns of Henry and Stephen I. Henry II. (Plantagenet) even made the attempt to obtain from the English prelates sanction for the hitherto unlawful practices, and imagined he had found a fitting tool to work out his design in his splendor-loving chancellor, Thomas à Becket, whom he had raised to the archiepiscopal See of Canterbury.

The new primate, who, from having been a lover of exterior luxury, now became a man of austere and ascetic life, was very far from the thought of sacrificing the interests of the Church. As early as the year 1162 he resisted the pretensions of the king with regard to the "privilegium fori" at an assembly in Westminster; but he was at last induced to accept "hereditary customs" without reservation. These were more clearly formulated on the 30th of January, 1164, in sixteen articles, at the assembly at Clarendon.¹

¹ *Consuetudines vitae.* Among other things they determine: (Art. 1) That contests respecting the right of patronage or of presentation are to be brought before the royal court of judicature for decision. (Art. 3) That clerics accused of crime or misdemeanor must first be brought before the royal judicial court, and then before the spiritual court, at the proceedings of which a royal officer was to be present. (Art. 4) Archbishops, bishops, and all persons of the kingdom who possess fiefs of the kingdom, shall not leave the kingdom without permission of the king, etc. (Art. 5) Excommunicated persons need only give security that they will appear before the ecclesiastical court. (Art. 6) No vassal or servant of the king may be excommunicated, or his territory laid under an interdict, without its being agreed to by the king, who shall decide what belongs to the royal curia to determine and what to the spiritual. (Art. 8) Without the royal permission no one may appeal to Rome. (Art. 9) Contests between the clergy and laity, as to whether any property belongs to the church or is the fief of a layman, must first be brought before the judicial officer of the king. (Art. 10) He who is cited before the spiritual court from any holding or possession of the king, and does not put in an appearance, may be laid under an interdict, but must not be excommunicated before the chief officer of the king has been requested to urge him to appear. (Art. 12) *Quum vacaverit archiepiscopatus vel episcopatus vel abbatia vel prioratus de dominio regis, debet esse in manu ejus et inde percipiet omnes redditus et exitus sicut dominicos.* Et quum ventum fuerit ad consulendum ecclesiae, debet dominus rex mandare potiores personas ecclesiae et in capella ipsius debet electio fieri assensu regis et consilio personarum regui, quas ad hoc faciendum vocaverit. Et ibidem faciet electus homagium et fidelitatem Domino regi, sicut ligio Domino de vita

The articles of Clarendon subjected the Church entirely to the king's caprice. Thomas perceived this, and immediately repented of what he had done; he suspended himself from office, and sent to Pope Alexander III. information concerning what had happened. This brought him under the king's displeasure, who, excited thereto by the enemies of the archbishop, brought many heavy accusations against him at the Council of Northampton. Thomas, whom the cowardly prelates deserted, secretly left England, and appealed to the Pope, to whom he resorted at Sens.

There he was confronted with a deputation of English bishops and barons, who had arrived before him; and notwithstanding their intrigues and those of some cardinals whom they had bribed, Alexander III. received him in a friendly manner, and of the sixteen articles of Clarendon condemned ten. Thomas found an honorable asylum in the Abbey of Pontigny.

The enraged king now sought to break the courage of the archbishop and of his papal protector. But neither the cruel persecution of the friends and relatives of the primate, nor Henry's negotiations with Frederic I., brought him nearer to his aim. He was compelled, on the 22d July, 1170, when threatened with excommunication, to comply with the righteous demands of the archbishop, who thereupon returned to England.

Not long after his arrival in Canterbury he was murdered (Dec. 29, 1170), in consequence of an incautious expression of Henry, "Is there no one who will rid me of this turbulent priest?"

The death of this heroic defender of the prerogatives of the Church insured the victory of the good cause. Alexander excommunicated the murderers of the archbishop and their protectors. But the king, who bitterly lamented his incautious expression, sent an embassy to the Pope to exculpate himself, undertook the performance of a public penance, and made a pilgrimage to the grave of the holy martyr, which God glorified with miracles. He also promised to restore her rights to the Church. This was at least partly done, at an assembly at Northampton in 1176.

It is unjustly maintained that Adrian IV., by a bull, intended to transfer Ireland as a fief to England for the payment of an annual tribute. The Pope simply consented to the plan of Henry II., which, according to the English chronicles, was also approved by the Irish bishops, to restore religion to a

sua et membris et de honore suo terreno, salvo ordine suo, priusquam sit consecratus. (Art. 15) All "Placita" on debts, whether word of honor be given or not, belong for decision to the royal curia. The articles adduced here were rejected by Pope Alexander.

better condition in Ireland, where it was at that time on the decline. The papal commission was solely a personal matter, and does by no means imply a transfer of temporal dominion; the subsequent pretensions of English rulers were neither foreseen nor in any way recognized by the Pope.¹ Even the authenticity of the bull is doubtful, as it bears no date.

§ 119. *The Relation which the Hohenstaufens bore to the Church, under the Successors of Alexander III.*

After the Emperor Frederic had, in the Peace of Constance, 1183, surrendered the enactments of Roncaglia, and had come to an agreement with the Lombard cities, he undertook a new expedition to Italy, and met the Pope Lucius III. (1181-1185) in Verona. The Pope, however, could not accede to Frederic's demands, as Frederic had not relinquished possession of Matilda's property, and would not renounce his previous designs concerning Italy. The outbreak of a new conflict in consequence of the violation of the Concordat of Worms, by the imperial interference in the election of the Bishop of Treves, was imminent, and was only prevented by the death of the Pope, who during his whole pontificate had had to contend with the rebellious Romans. His successor, Urban III., remonstrated most forcibly with the emperor respecting his encroachments on Church prerogative. Frederic, who wished to add Sicily to his dominion by the marriage of his son (afterward Henry VI.) to the Princess Constantia, replied to him by inflicting new injuries on the Church through his cruel son, while the German prelates, terrified by him, sent from the Diet of Gelnhausen a letter to the Pope that gave him no hope of their coming to his aid. Notwithstanding this, Urban had determined to pronounce ecclesiastical censures on Frederic. Only the petition of the inhabitants of Verona prevented his doing so.

Urban, who died of grief at Jernusalem's being taken by Saladin, was succeeded by Gregory VIII., who reigned only two months. Under his successor, Clement III., who at length came to an understanding with the restless Romans, the relation between the Apostolic See and Frederic assumed a better footing. The son, Henry VI., however, fell into new dissensions with the Pope, who had invested Tancred of Lecce with Sicily. These dissensions, under Celestine III. (1191-1198), assumed a very serious character. This peace-loving

¹ Compare *Abbé McGroarty's* Hist. of Ireland. Cardinal Moran and others learned in Irish history, hold the bull to be a forgery. No mention of it is to be found in the Vatican Archives, etc. See Dublin Review, April, 1886, p. 461.

old man, who had placed the imperial crown on Henry's head, was finally compelled to threaten the emperor with excommunication unless he set at liberty Richard Cœur de Lion, who, in violation of the rights of nations, had been taken prisoner by Leopold of Austria and transferred to the hands of Henry ; and Henry had also transgressed the rights of the Church in the episcopal election at Liege and in other matters. The emperor promised to comply with the Pope's wishes ; but he did not keep his word,—he was still bent in all earnestness on his project of gaining Sicily and Germany for his family. He, with the help of the Genoese and Pisans, gained Sicily in 1194 ; he then hastened to Germany, where he secured, not indeed the right of inheritance for the crown, but the election of his two-year-old son Frederic as king. He then returned to lower Italy, where he inflicted horrible cruelties on both the clergy and the laity, until death freed the world, in 1197, from a tyrant who rewarded his friends with ingratitude in its basest form.

Celestine died in the same year, and was succeeded by the youthful and energetic Innocent III.

§ 120. *Pope Innocent III.*

Endowed with the most splendid gifts of body and mind, rich in theological and profane knowledge, and having a very clear perception of the necessities and requirements of the age in which he lived, Cardinal Lothaire, of the illustrious family of Conti, ascended the throne of Peter (1198-1216), at the age of thirty-seven, as Innocent III. He fully grasped the responsibilities of his high office, and was earnest in his endeavor to meet them in all their extended relationships.

After restoring his supremacy in Rome, Innocent, who thoroughly reformed the papal court, regained for the Apostolic See those provinces of which it had been deprived by the Emperor Henry VI. Southern Tuscany (the inheritance of Matilda) also came into the possession of the Pope, to whom the Tuscan and Lombard League also submitted. Pisa alone remained Ghibelline. The papal rights in reference to the kingdoms of the Two Sicilies were again acknowledged. Queen Constantia renewed the ancient feudal relation to the Holy See, relinquishing the so-called four chapters ; and when dying (+ Nov. 27, 1198), she committed the guardianship of her son Frederic to the Pope, who preserved for him the Sicilian crown.

At the death of Henry VI., there were in Germany two parties opposed to each other,—the friends of the Hohenstaufens, who

elected the brother of the Emperor Philip of Suabia king; and the other princes who elected Otho IV., a son of Henry the Lion, to that office. The claims of Frederic II. did not even come under consideration. Both of the candidates were crowned, — Otho at Aix-la-Chapelle, and Philip at Mentz. At first Innocent did not interfere in German affairs, although Otho was urgent in requesting recognition as king, and Philip also informed him of his election. Meantime civil war broke out in Germany. In order to put an end to it, the Pope admonished the princes of the empire to give up their disunion and take care of the empire, adding that otherwise he would be compelled to interfere. This same answer he also gave to the embassy from Philip, whose adherents then addressed a very offensive letter to Innocent. The Pope, who in his "Deliberation" set forth and examined the reasons for and against the claims of the three candidates for the crown, answered this letter, and after his attempt to have the struggle for the throne peaceably settled by the mediation of Archbishop Conrad of Mentz (1200), he sent the Cardinal Bishop Guido of Præneste as legate to Germany, by whom he addressed a circular letter to the princes, requiring them to come to an understanding in the matter of a candidate for the royal and imperial throne, as he otherwise must decide officially. This document is dated January, 1201. In March of the same year, Innocent declared in favor of Otho, and in a letter¹ justified his conduct. But as Philip's adherents had increased in number since 1204, Innocent, out of regard to the popular wish, entered into new negotiations with the parties, and summoned plenipotentiaries from each side to Rome. While these negotiations were yet pending, Philip was murdered by the Count Palatine Otho of Wittelsbach, June 21, 1208.

Otho IV. now married Beatrice, the daughter of Philip, and at the instance of the Pope was acknowledged king. He guaranteed, by a written document,² at Spire, 1209, the rights and liberties of the Church, and on the 4th of October, of the same year, was crowned emperor at Rome. Otho, having now attained his object, turned

¹ Registr. n. 62 as decretal *Venerabilem in corp. jnr. can. (c. 34, x. de elect. i. 6)*. Innocent fully acknowledges the right of the German princes to elect their king, but at the same time claims the privilege of rejecting or adopting any candidate elected to the imperial dignity who, as emperor, became the protector of the Church; and in case of such rejection the princes would have to proceed to a new election or to resign the imperial crown. This resolution of the Pope accorded with the practice then in use, and with the nature of the matter in hand.

² Registr. n. 189.

against the Church, to which he owed everything. In violation of his oath he wrested several provinces from the States of the Church, invaded Apulia, and acted as if he intended to subjugate the whole of Italy. After several fruitless admonitions, Innocent, on Holy Thursday, 1211, pronounced the sentence of excommunication on the emperor, which brought about his deposition at the Diet of Nuremberg, and the total decline of his authority. Neither his appearing personally in Germany nor his English subsidies could maintain him on his throne. With the consent of the Pope, the German princes elected Frederic II. king, who, on the assembling of the princes at Eger, 1213, took oaths similar to those which had been taken by Otho. After conquering the latter at the battle of Bovines, Frederic was crowned king at Aix-la-Chapelle, by the Archbishop of Mentz, in 1215. Even then he promised a crusade.

Innocent had to exercise his papal authority in England also,¹ where John Lackland, the unprincipled brother of Richard Cœur de Lion, was king. The occasion was the appointment of a new archbishop of Canterbury. The monks of Christ Church, refusing to acknowledge the suffragan bishops as voters, secretly elected their subprior Reginald archbishop, enjoining him to keep the matter secret until the papal confirmation arrived. Reginald, however, conducted himself as archbishop, even while on the journey to Rome, which occasioned contentions; and these gave a pretext to the king to put forward his own candidate. In fact, the monks themselves, now rejecting Reginald, voted for the king's candidate, John de Grey, Bishop of Norwich, for whose confirmation they applied in Rome. Innocent, to whom the suffragan bishops of Canterbury had appealed, declared that the right of voting lay with the monks alone; but he rejected both candidates, and ordered a new election to take place by the deputies of the monks in Rome. Their choice fell on Stephen Langton, an Englishman of some eminence. As King John refused his approval of the election, the Pope consecrated the new archbishop at Viterbo, June 17, 1207. John now revenged himself upon the monks; but in consequence of doing so, he brought his kingdom under the ban of an interdict (1208), and caused his own excommunication (1209).

As the king offered no hope of coming to a peaceable understanding, and as, after putting down the sedition of 1211, he practised great cruelties and atrocities, the Pope absolved John's subjects from their oaths of allegiance to him, and opened to the King of

¹ *Lingard, Hist. of England, iii.*

France a prospect of the English throne, should John persist in his obstinacy.¹ Philip Augustus (April 8, 1213) resolved at Soissons to undertake a war against John. The disaffection at home and the French preparations for war brought the tyrant to his senses. He negotiated with the papal legate, Pandulf, and submitted to the Apostolic See, from which he received England as a fief in 1213.² Innocent then forbade the King of France to invade England.

But now the barons rose against the king and his arbitrary government, and, sustained by the new archbishop, Stephen Langton, wrested from him the Great Charter of liberty in 1215 ("Magna Charta libertatis"). John complained of this compulsory action to the Pope.

Innocent, as feudal lord, disapproved of the manner in which the barons had acted, rejected the Charter, but promised to redress their grievances. The barons, however, did not accept this decision, and neither the spiritual censures nor the sword of the king could re-establish peace in England. The discontented even offered the English crown to the French Dauphin, Louis VIII. The Pope warned him off. Yet Philip Augustus defended the claims of his son in Rome, while the latter landed in England and made his entry into London. For this he was excommunicated by the papal legate. John died during the contest (1216). His son, Henry III., under the protection of the Apostolic See, at last came to an agreement with Louis. During his reign the Great Charter was renewed.

Innocent was compelled to inflict sentence of excommunication on King Philip Augustus of France, and place the kingdom under an interdict, in order to induce the king to take back his lawful wife Ingelberga, whom he had repudiated. The Pope also protected the sanctity and indissolubility of marriage against Alphonso IX. of Leon and Peter II. of Aragon, who had made his kingdom tributary to the Apostolic See. Against King Sancho I. of Portugal, Innocent defended the liberties of the Church, and resolutely proceeded against Swerker, King of Norway, who had already been excommunicated by Celestine III.; but only after this king's death could peace and order be re-established in the country. In Sweden, Innocent also took decisive measures against abuses. In Poland he

¹ *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, v. 728.

² *Communi consilio baronum nostrorum (Innoc. Ep. xvi. 77)*. John had promised an annual tribute of a thousand pounds sterling. The exiled clergy were to return and to receive indemnity for their losses.

aided the good Archbishop of Gnesen in his efforts at effecting a reform, and compelled Duke Ladislaus of Great Poland, by a threat of excommunication, to cease from oppressing the Church. In Hungary, the Pope adjusted the difficulties between the two brothers, Emmerie and Andrew, who were at feud with each other. His epistle to the Russian archbishops, written with the view of bringing them back to the unity of the Church, was not successful. Yet under this same great Pope, the Bulgarians returned to the Roman Church,¹ and the Latin Empire was founded at Constantinople. St. Dominic and St. Francis founded their orders.

Foreseeing that death was approaching, Innocent made a worthy conclusion to a life so rich in deeds by convoking

THE TWELFTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, 1215 (LATERAN IV.),²

which was attended by seventy-one primates and metropolitans, four hundred and twelve bishops, among whom were the Eastern patriarchs,—some personally, some by representatives,—eight hundred abbots and priors, many princes and their legates. The council occupied itself chiefly in organizing a new crusade.³ It discussed and passed several important enactments of discipline, accurately defined the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (“transubstantiatio”), condemned the heresy of the Albigenses, and adjusted several political contentions.

Innocent III. died at Perugia, on July 16, 1216. He united in himself all the qualities of a distinguished man. He was a great ruler, an excellent head of Christendom, and a genuine supreme bishop,—one who “filled the city and the world by the splendor of his deeds.” In knowledge of theology and of canon law he excelled his contemporaries, and amidst his manifold occupations he yet found time to preach the truths of salvation to the faithful, to take care of the widows and orphans, and to afford efficient help to those in need.

¹ See § 144.

² *Harduin*, tom. vii. *Mansi*, tom. xxii. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, v. In his proclamation the Pope says he has two things very much at heart, the regaining of the Holy Land, and the amendment of the whole Church. It is with this view that he convoked the council. The opening speech the Pope began with the words of Christ: *Desiderio desideravi* (Luke xxii. 15). The acts of the synod are only partially extant (the seventy Capitula and the decree respecting the Crusades).

³ See § 109.

§ 121. *Conflict of the Popes Honorius III., Gregory IX., and Innocent IV., with the Emperor Frederic II.*

Frederic II., soon after ascending the throne, adopted the policy of his predecessors the Hohenstaufens, and assumed an attitude towards the Church which made one fear the worst.

Hostilities began under Innocent's successor, Honorius III., a mild and placable old man (1216-1227). In vain did this Pope remind Frederic that at Aix-la-Chapelle he had promised to set out on the crusade. The king was always putting off the fulfilment of his promise, and used the time to obtain for his son Henry, who was already King of Sicily, also the royal crown of Germany, although he had repeatedly guaranteed to the Apostolic See the separation of the two kingdoms, which was so necessary to the freedom of the Pope. Promises and privileges won the princes; Henry was elected king, while a deceptive report appeased the Pope. Honorius tolerated what he could no longer prevent, and on the 22d of November, 1220, conferred the imperial crown on Frederic. On this occasion Frederic renewed his vows to go to the Crusades; but, notwithstanding the most urgent admonitions of the Pope, he made no preparations to fulfil his promises. At Veroli (1222), at Ferentino (1223), and at San Germano (1225), he asked for longer respite, but let the time granted pass inactively, to the greatest injury of the Holy Land and to the destruction of the Crusaders. So much the more was he intent upon increasing his regal power in lower Italy, whereby he grievously violated the rights of the Church, and bitterly offended the Apostolic See by driving away from their sees five bishops appointed by Honorius. The stand made by the Lombards, whom the emperor thought to subjugate, brought him to a pause. He acknowledged the five bishops, and relaxed somewhat in his persecutions. Honorius became mediator between Frederic and the Lombards, and effected a peace, although even then the emperor gave evidence of an unchristian and inconstant disposition.

Under the successor of Honorius the gigantic strife between the "Imperium" and the "Sacerdotium" broke forth. Gregory IX. (1227-1241), an aged man, both noble and courageous, after all amicable efforts to prevail on Frederic to accomplish his vow had proved fruitless, pronounced at Anagni (1227) the sentence of excommunication against him.

On this the emperor published his manifesto of warfare against the Church, in which he clearly exposed his hostile projects; he forced the clergy, in spite of the interdict, to perform ecclesiastical functions, and exerted himself to engage princes and people on his side. He revenged himself on Gregory, who, on Holy Thursday, 1228, had repeated the excommunication, by driving him out of Rome. The Pope, who had acted, not from passion, but from the principle of duty, justified his conduct towards the emperor in an encyclical.¹

The excommunicated man continued to play his hypocritical part, crowning the work when he, though laden with the anathema of the Church, set out on the crusade, "in order not to lose his authority in the West." After a short stay in the Holy Land he returned to Italy. Through the mediation of the Dominican Gualo and others, the peace of San Germano was effected (July 23, 1230). Frederic promised submission on all those points whereby he had drawn excommunication on himself; he was then again received into the Church.

It was unfortunately but a few years after the conclusion of this peace that the conflict broke out anew; for the emperor, who looked on the whole of Italy as his own property, did not relinquish his absolute and anti-eccllesiastical plans, but endeavored, by means of the "Sicilian Law-book" (collection of the laws of Sicily), edited by Peter de Vinea, to render the Church subservient to the power of the State; while his associate, the furious Ezzelino, exerted himself to break the resistance of the Lombards by the most outrageous cruelties. It was in vain that the Pope raised his voice in favor of the rights of the Church and the liberty of the subject. Frederic took no heed of the admonition of the Pope, who had given him so beautiful a proof of his good will in his action against his rebellious son Henry, but permitted the Saracen mercenaries to commit with impunity every kind of cruelty while he was in Germany, conducting the election of his son Conrad.

Fortune favored the emperor. Towards the end of 1237 he defeated the Milanese and their allies at the battle of Cortenuova, and made them taste the full bitterness of his domination. Frederic now stood at the height of his power. The representations and grievances of the Pope he replied to scornfully and evasively, while he perpetrated new acts of violence against the Church. The duty of his office called upon the Pope to act; he again excom-

¹ *Huillard-Breholles, Hist. diplom. Friedr. II., tom. iii. 24 sqq.*

municated Frederic, and released his subjects from their oath of allegiance for such time as the excommunication should last (March 20 and 24, 1239).

The Pope gave the reasons for his conduct in a bull.¹ Frederic also sought to justify himself before the world. Neither he nor those about him lacked talent. In the choice of means the excommunicated man was not over-particular. He sought to win back a part of the clergy, to sow distrust against the Apostolic See among the princes, and to spread the suspicion among the people that the Pope had acted from passion and egotism. He also evoked the national feeling in favor of this object, and while he feigned to entertain in other matters the most friendly sentiments towards the Apostolic See, Frederic with characteristic hypocrisy expressed himself quite differently in his own circle. Moreover, where the arts of persuasion failed, violence was used to effect the purpose. This was chiefly the case in Italy, as in Germany most of the prelates and princes sided with the emperor. No common cause for this striking conduct can be assigned, as one prince might be influenced by one motive, another by another. Meantime the emperor, rejecting all proposals of peace, marched on to Rome (1240). Gregory, having reanimated the courage of the Romans by a solemn procession (February 22), convoked, as a last resource (Aug. 9, 1240), a council, that, if possible, peace might be restored. Although Frederic had always demanded the convocation of a council, he now did his utmost to prevent their meeting. When, in spite of his threats, a number of French and English prelates had taken passage on Genoese ships, and were on their way to Rome, their vessels were attacked by Enzio, an illegitimate son of Frederic, and they themselves were either murdered or taken prisoners (May 3, 1241); the latter, amongst whom were the papal legates, were very harshly ill-treated, and shut up in the loathsome dungeons of Apulia.

Gregory, who was himself hard pressed by the imperial troops in Rome, could afford no other succor than consolation by words to the imprisoned bishops, many of whom died of the ill-treatment they received. The Pope himself died of grief for this shameful outrage, at the age of about one hundred years, Aug. 21, 1241.

The cardinals elected Goffredo Castiglione (Celestine IV.), who died two weeks after his election. After his death the Holy See remained for some time vacant. A new election was attended by many difficulties. The two cardinals, James of Palestrina and Otho of St.

¹ *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1239, n. 1 sqq.

Nicholas, were still detained in prison. But Frederic, yielding at length to the energetic remonstrances of France and England, set them at liberty. The Sacred College met at Anagni, June, 1243, and elected the learned and able Cardinal Sinibald Fiesco of Genoa (Innocent IV., 1243-1254) as head of the Church.

The proposition which the new Pope caused to be submitted to the emperor¹ is a sublime monument of his peaceful disposition. Yet Frederic answered it with new aggressions. It was not till after long negotiations that he promised (March 31, 1244) by oath to submit to the judgment of the Pope in all those matters for which he had been excommunicated by Gregory IX., as well as respecting the injury he had done to the Church. He, however, again broke his oath, and strove to get Innocent into his power. In order to save himself and the liberty of the Church, Innocent fled, first to Genoa, thence to Lyons, where he held

THE THIRTEENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, 1245 (LYONS I.).²

At this council Emperor Frederic II., whom his chancellor, Thaddeus of Suessa, defended, was excommunicated and deposed for his many crimes: especially, (1) Because he had repeatedly broken his oath by violating the treaties he had concluded with the Church; (2) Because he had committed a sacrilege by taking prisoners ecclesiastics travelling to the council (1241); (3) Because by many acts he had rendered himself suspected of heresy; (4) Because in the kingdom of Sicily he had robbed clergymen and laymen, had driven them off or made slaves of them, or had compelled them to take up arms against the Church, to which he did not perform his duties as a vassal.

From this sentence Thaddeus of Suessa, who was not able to refute these grave charges, appealed to a true ecumenical council. The excommunicated emperor now set every force in action in order to deal a decisive blow against the papacy. To gain allies, he entered into combination with all the enemies of the Church. He hoped to overcome the resistance of the clergy by rewarding the bad ones among their members, and by cruelly persecuting the faithful ones. He deceived the people by publishing fallacious manifes-

¹ *Huillard-Bréholles*, vi. 112.

² *Harduin*, tom. vii. *Mansi*, tom. xxiii. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, v. 981 sqq.

³ According to the statement of Gregory IX., Frederic asserted: *Homo debet nihil aliud credere, nisi quod potest vi et ratione naturae probare*; and, *A tribus baratoribus scil. Christu Jesu, Moyse, Machometo totum mundum fuisse deceptum*.

toes, and sought to win the good will of the cities by granting them privileges. He also wrote private letters to the kings of France and England, requesting their support. But all these efforts only went to prove "that in regard to the Church the mightiest tyrants are but as impotent boys."

The power of the mighty Hohenstaufens was broken. The German princes elected Henry Raspe, and at his death William of Holland, king in 1247.

Many imperial cities of Italy threw off their allegiance; at last, even Pisa. Frederic's army suffered a great defeat near Parma, 1249. In the next year the excommunicated emperor, who had made even his most intimate friends, such as Peter of Vineis, feel the effects of his cruelty, fell sick and died at Fiorentino, 1250. On his death-bed he made a partial atonement for his crimes.

§ 122. *The Popes from Innocent IV. to Boniface VIII.—Fall of the Hohenstaufens.—Interregnum.—French Influence on the Apostolic See.*

The conflicts of the Hohenstaufens with the Apostolic See were injurious alike to Church and State. Italy especially had to feel the disadvantage attendant on the gigantic struggle, which was principally fought out on her own soil. The main object of this struggle had been the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Innocent IV. considered this as a papal fief. Conrad IV., Frederic's son, claimed it as his inheritance. His half-brother Manfred, Prince of Tarentum, fought for him. In the year 1252 Conrad came to Italy in person, and the Pope also returned thither.

The negotiations of the latter with France and England, respecting the crown of Sicily, led to no result. Conrad finally came into possession of the kingdom, but died as early as May 20, 1254, leaving a young son, Conradi, two years of age, to whom the Pope refused the enfeoffment of Sicily, while he acknowledged all his other claims. To restore order, the Pope entered into an agreement with the faithless Manfred, who immediately afterwards renewed hostilities. Meantime, in the midst of the struggle, Pope Innocent died, at Naples, on the 7th of December, 1254. His successor, Alexander IV. (1254-1261), re-entered into negotiations with England. Manfred, however, whose treaty with Cardinal Octavian had not received the papal sanction, had himself crowned king at Palermo. The Pope now offered to compromise with the usurper; but his conditions were

rejected by Manfred, who invaded the States of the Church with his Saracens, and likewise excited a revolt of the Ghibellines in Tuscany and Lombardy. The Guelphs, who were loyal to the Church, were oppressed. Alexander retired to Viterbo, where he died on the 25th of May, 1261. On the 29th of August the (eight) cardinals elected Urban IV. (1261-1264) Pope; he had a crusade published against Manfred.

After the death of William of Holland, a double election for king took place in Germany. One part of the princes chose Richard of Cornwall; the other, Alphouso X. (the Wise), King of Castile. Both had desired the imperial crown at the hands of Alexander IV., and both now addressed themselves for this purpose to his successor; while the vacillating German princes, who were for the most part bribed, desired to elevate the young Conradin to the royal throne. Urban forbade the election of Conradin, and required the candidates to lay their respective claims to the German crown before himself, which after great difficulties they agreed to do; but before the Pope could pronounce a judicial decision, he died.

As Prince Edmund of England was not in a condition to make good his claim to the crown of Sicily, Urban offered it to Charles of Anjou, who, with the approval of his brother Louis IX., accepted it. The new vassal of the Holy See appeared in Rome in the year 1265, paid homage to Clement IV. (1265-1268), and after defeating Manfred (Feb. 6, 1266), took possession of the kingdom.

The exasperation occasioned by the tyranny of Charles, who paid no attention to the paternal warnings and exhortations of the Pope, and even oppressed the States of the Church, was made use of by the young Conradin to gain a footing in lower Italy. It was in vain that the Pope threatened him with excommunication. Conradin invaded Apulia with an army, and at first was favored by fortune; but the defeat near Tagliacozzo crushed all his hopes. He fell as a captive into the hands of Charles, and at his command was beheaded at Naples, 1268. In the same year Pope Clement IV. died; and it was not till the year 1271 that his successor, Gregory X. (1271-1276), was elected by fifteen cardinals at Viterbo.

Under him was held, at Lyons, the numerously attended

FOURTEENTH ECUMENICAL COUNCIL (LYONS II.), 1274,

in which a new crusade was earnestly discussed, the reunion of the schismatic Greeks with the Church concluded,¹ and various canons respecting morals and discipline enacted.

¹ *Harduin*, tom. vii. *Mansi*, tom. xxiv. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vi. 103 sqq.

After the death of Richard of Cornwall, in 1273, Rudolph, Count of Hapsburg, was, at the instance of Gregory, finally elected King of Germany, and invited by the Pope to receive the imperial crown. At a meeting between Gregory and Rudolph at Lausanne, the latter confirmed by oath the promises which his ambassadors had already made in his name at the Council of Lyons. Unfortunately, the king, who had a powerful enemy in Ottokar of Bohemia, did not succeed in restoring perfect peace to Germany. While yet on the route to Rome, Gregory died, at Arezzo, on the 10th of January, 1276. It was not vouchsafed to him to witness the restoration of order which the conflicting parties in Italy had disturbed.

To render a delay in the election of a Pope impossible, Gregory X. had, with the consent of the Council of Lyons, issued the Constitution "Ubi periculum,"¹ by which, among other matters, the conclave was established; and, indeed, after ten days he had a successor in Innocent V., on whose death, in June, 1276, Adrian V. for thirty-nine days was seated in the papal chair. John XXI. followed him therein.² John revoked the Constitution of Gregory re-

¹ Conc. Lugd. can. 2. Bonifacius VIII. admitted the constitution into the Corp. juris can. cap. 3, *Ubi periculum de elect. in vi.* (I. 6). The rule on the conclave runs thus: *Statuimus, ut, si eundem pontificem in civitate, in qua cum sua curia residencebat, diem claudere contingat extrellum, cardinales, qui fuerint in civitate ipsa praesentes, absentes exspectare decem diebus tantummodo teneatur. Quibus elapsis, sive absentes venerint sive non, ex tunc omnes convenient in palatio, in quo idem Pontifex habitabat, contenti singuli singulis tantummodo servientibus clericis vel laicis, prout duxerint eligendum. Illis tamen, quibus patens necessitas id suggestit indulgeri, duos habere permittimus, eisdem electionis arbitrio reservato. In eodem autem palatio unum conclave, nullo intermedio pariete seu alio velamine, omnes inhabitent in communi, quod, reservato libero ad secretam cameram aditu, ita claudatur undique, ut nullus illud intrare valeat vel exire. Nulli ad eosdem cardinales aditus pateat, vel facultas secrete loquendi cum eis, nec ipsi aliquos ad se venientes admittant, nisi eos, qui de voluntate omnium cardinalium inibi praesentium pro his tantum, quae ad electionis instantis negotium pertinent, vocarentur. Nulli etiam fas sit, ipsis cardinalibus vel eorum alicui nuncium mittere vel scripturam: qui vero contra fecerit, scripturam mittendo vel nuncium, aut cum aliquo ipsorum secrete loquendo, ipso facto sententiam excommunicationis incurrat. In conclave tamen praedicto aliqua fenestra competens dimittatur, per quam eisdem cardinalibus ad victum commode necessaria ministrentur; sed per eam nulli ad ipsos patere possit ingressus. Verum si, (quod absit) infra tres dies, postquam, ut praedicatur, conclave praefatum iidem cardinales intraverint, non fuerit ipsi ecclesiae de pastore provisum, per spatium quinque dierum immediate sequentium singulis diebus tam in prandio quam in coena uno solo fereulo sint contenti; quibus, provisione non facta, cursus, ex tunc tantummodo panis, vinum et aqua ministrentur eisdem, donec eadem provisio subsequatur.*

² Since the time of Urban IV. the Popes have been accustomed to add numbers to

specting the conclave,¹ which his predecessor had already intended to do, and was about to issue a new ordinance concerning papal elections, when, after an eight months' reign, the ceiling of his chamber fell in upon him and wounded him so severely that he shortly after died. It was not till November, 1277, that his successor, Nicholas III., was elected. This Pope, in an agreement with Rudolph of Hapsburg, established the supreme rights of the Pope over the States of the Church, and obliged Charles of Anjou to renounce the right of Roman senator and of the vicariate over Tuscany. On the other hand, he did not succeed in raising enthusiasm and means for another crusade. Nicholas was a man of great piety and of strict morals, but was unhappily too intent on raising the members of his family (the Orsini) to a high position. After his death, at the instance of Charles of Anjou, Martin IV.² (1281-1285) was elected Pope at Viterbo. He sided altogether with this prince, on whose opponents he inflicted the censures of the Church. But neither by spiritual means nor by the power of arms could he obtain for his favorite the reconquest of Sicily, the inhabitants of which, on the 31st of March, 1282, in the horrible massacre denominated the Sicilian Vespers, had shaken off the French yoke, and had called Peter III. of Aragon to the throne. This prince had given consent to the conspiracy which had carried out the aforesigned massacre. The too frequent and not always just infliction of the ecclesiastical censures contributed to bring them into contempt, and by so doing to undermine the authority of the Pope.³

Under Honorius IV. (1285-1287), who after the death of Charles of Anjou sought to protect the inhabitants of the Two Sicilies from oppression by wise laws, and under Nicholas IV. (1288-1292), the Sicilian complications still continued, whilst in Germany, after the death of Rudolph of Hapsburg (+ 1291), a new civil war broke out.

On the death of Nicholas, the Holy See remained vacant for twenty-seven months. The eleven cardinals, who had been split into two parties, came to an understanding, and elected the pious their names. John is properly the twentieth of this name (John XIX., + 1033). See § 90. He was erroneously called John XXI.

¹ The living together in one hall was inconvenient and troublesome to some of the old and sickly cardinals. Some died in consequence of it. It was his knowledge of this that formed the chief motive of John XXI. in altering the Constitution of Gregory X.

² The two Popes Marius are counted in with him, as there was but one Pope Martin before this one (Martin IV.).

³ Epp. *Mart.* IV. in *D'Achery*, *Spicileg.* iii. 684 sqq.

hermit Peter from the mountain Murrone, near Sulmona, Pope, by the name of Celestine V.¹ This Pope, however, did not possess ability sufficient to steer the rudder of the Church in such critical times; and besides this he fell unduly under the influence of Charles II. of Naples, who in conjunction with some eccentric monks led him to perform several indiscreet actions, prejudicial to the welfare of the Church.² Fortunately, the Holy Pope, who had taken up his residence first in Aquila and afterwards at Naples, recognized his own inability to fill an office which he had undertaken with reluctance, and resigned his dignity in December, 1294.³ His successor was Cardinal Benedict Cajetan (Boniface VIII.), who immediately after his coronation left Naples and took up his residence at Rome.

§ 123. *The Pontificate of Boniface VIII.*

Guided by the same principles as were his illustrious predecessors, the learned and able, but too often misapprehended Pope Boniface VIII. (1294–1303), displayed extraordinary energy in the promotion of the well-being of the Church and of humanity; but unfortunately, his measures frequently failed in attaining the success he hoped for, which may be accounted for by the change in the political circumstances of the times, and especially by the reaction which in the course of years had taken place in the sentiments of princes regarding the papacy.

Even the first official act of the Pope — the limitation, or rather the revoking, of the concessions so lavishly made by Celestine V. to the disadvantage of the Church — brought upon him the enmity of many families of distinction, who under the pretext that Celestine had not the right or the power to resign, contested the validity of the election of the new Pope, and thus compelled him to keep his aged predecessor in a sort of honorable captivity in the castle of Fumone, to escape the danger of a schism. This well-grounded conduct of the Pope furnished his opponents, especially the so-called Celestine monks, with material for accusing Boniface of acting with too great harshness. At the same time they spread the most extraordinary reports about the treatment Celestine received, and concerning the

¹ Cf. *Acta Sanct. ed. Boll.* Paris, 1866, Maii, tom. iv. p. 418 sqq.

² The renewal of the decree of Gregory X. concerning the conclave was of advantage to the Church.

³ *Tostii, Storia di Bonifacio VIII.*, pp. 231, 243.

manner of his death, May 19, 1296, — reports which were in striking contradiction to the facts of the case.¹

The two cardinals, James and Peter Colonna, countenanced by their powerful family, were also dangerous enemies of the Pope. They at first entered into secret treasonable relationships with the Aragonians and other opponents of the Holy See, and then speedily came to open attacks respecting the validity of the papal election. When all peaceable means had been exhausted and had failed to effect a good purpose, Boniface pronounced the sentence of suspension and confiscation of property against them, and ordered their strongholds, Palestrina, Zagarolo, and others, to be destroyed by an army of crusaders. The besieged, whose renewed attempts at revolt were soon suppressed, fled, and found an asylum partly in Sicily and partly in France. Here they eagerly seized on the opportunity to revenge themselves on the Pope.²

Boniface, with untiring zeal, exercised his high office as mediator of peace between the contending powers, whom he sought to inflame with a common enthusiasm to undertake a crusade against the Saracens.

Yet the Pope met with difficulties on every side. The treaty between Charles II. of Naples and James II. of Aragon, which Boniface confirmed on June 21, 1295, seemed to have restored peace to Sicily, when suddenly Frederic, the brother of James, laid claim to his right to govern the island, and was able to maintain that claim. At length, through the mediation of Charles of Valois, an agreement was effected by which the island, under the name of the Kingdom of Trinacria, was conceded for his lifetime to the Aragonian Frederic, who was to marry Eleonora, daughter of Charles II. To this Boniface, as suzerain, gave his assent, on the 12th of June, 1303.

In Germany, Adolphus of Nassau and Albert of Austria were contending for the crown. Right was on the side of the former, but he lost life and crown in a battle with Albert. Boniface, who had in vain sought to mediate a peace, in 1301 cited Albert before his judgment-seat, but became reconciled to him, and on the 30th of April, 1303, acknowledged him as king.

The most powerful opposition which Boniface met with was on the part of the French court. The king, Philip IV. (the Fair), was

¹ *Tosti*, i. 242 sqq. Giacopone da Todi, author of the "Stabat Mater," was one of the opponents of Boniface, on whom he composed several satires.

² *Cardinal Wiseman*, Pope Bonif. VIII. in treatises on various subjects.

at war with Edward I.¹ of England, and the Church had to bear the costs. To put an end to this strife, so fraught with evil consequences in all respects, Boniface called upon the contending parties to conclude an armistice, and offered to mediate between them himself. At the same time, on the 25th of February, 1296, he issued the bull "Clericis laicos," with the view of inducing the warring parties to conclude peace by the withdrawing of subsidies, as well as for the protection of the clergy, who had applied to the Pope to protect them against further extortions.² The appearance of this bull, which repeated the ancient ecclesiastical laws regarding the immunity of Church property, and placed severer penalties on the violation of the same, excited Philip's anger to a high degree. He pronounced the mediatorial efforts of the Pope to be encroachments on his own prerogatives, forbade all foreigners to carry on commerce with France, and prohibited the export of gold, precious stones, etc., without his permission. To conciliate the king, the Pope, on Sept. 25, 1296, issued the bull "Ineffabilis;"³ and in his more extended writings to the French clergy and to Philip he put the mildest possible interpretation on the decretal "Clericis laicos." Finally, indeed, he virtually withdrew this by the bull "Noveritis nos." On this the king withdrew his prohibition regarding the exportation of money, etc.; and the good understanding was again renewed between the king and the Pope, who, on the 11th of August, had canonized Philip's grandfather, Louis IX. The kings of France and England now accepted the arbitration of the Pope, but on the express condition that he should decide as Benedict Cajetan, and not as supreme head of the Church. But Philip was not satisfied with the decision he pronounced.

The friendly relations of Philip with the Apostolic See were of no long duration. The far-reaching plans pursued by the French court endangered the possessions, the liberty, and the autonomy of the Church, which compelled the Pope to take energetic measures.⁴ But Boniface wished first to try conciliatory measures, and therefore sent Bernhard de Saisset, Bishop of Pamiers, as nuncio to Philip to

¹ In regard to the extortions of Edward I. of England, see *Lingard's History of England*.

² *Tostii*, i. 255.

³ *Ibid.*, 257.

⁴ *Hergenröther*, Catholic Church and Christian State. In a memorial of the year 1300, the royal advocate, P. Dubois of Coutance, one of Philip's principal agents, put forth the proposal to secularize the States of the Church, and to found a so-called universal monarchy.

make earnest representations to him; but instead of acceding to the papal demands, the king, who had been already at variance with this particular bishop (now newly returned to his diocese), and who had, besides, his own private reasons for disliking him, caused him to be arrested on the charge of high-treason for various unproved crimes. He then had him cited before the state council at Senlis, Oct. 24, 1301, and from thence he was delivered up to the custody of the Archbishop of Narbonne. Boniface, who energetically demanded that the imprisoned bishop should be set at liberty, was by this conduct induced to withdraw from the king several of those privileges which he had so wofully misused, and to remonstrate with him in the bull of Dec. 5, 1301 ("Ausculta fili"), on the wrong done to the Church. He also summoned a synod to meet at Rome, at which French affairs should likewise come under discussion. Out of consideration for Philip, with whom Boniface wished to avoid a final rupture, he sent him an invitation to be present himself or by deputy at the said council. Misled by those about him, Philip, to whom James of Normans, Archdeacon of Narbonne (February, 1302), had presented the papal bull, had this bull publicly burnt; and in its stead he circulated another, a shorter one, prepared by an officer of his court, in which it was expressed, in harsh terms, that the king was subordinated to the Pope, alike in temporal as in spiritual matters.¹ This fictitious letter of the Pope, to which a feigned answer was purposely adapted by Philip, called forth a misunderstanding among the people, of which Philip was not slow to avail himself. He summoned a meeting of the nobility, the clergy, and the third estate, which assembled at Paris, on the 10th April, 1302, in the church of Notre Dame. The part of plaintiff was sustained by the chancellor, Peter Flotte, who accused the Pope of not only oppressing and laying burdens on the French church, but of wishing to subject the King of France to his will in temporal matters, and to become himself the temporal ruler of the kingdom.

The nobility and the third estate complied with the wishes of the king, who "as their master" commanded those assembled, and "as their friend" entreated them to give him the support of their counsel; and after a secret consultation they addressed insolent letters to the

¹ Deum time, et mandata ejus observa. Scire te volumus, *quod in spiritualibus et temporalibus nobis subes*. Beneficiorum et Praebendarum ad te collatio nulla spectat: et si aliquorum vacantium custodiam habeas, fructus eorum successoribus reserves; et si quae contulisti, collationem hujusmodi irritam decernimus, et quantum de facto processerit, revocamus. Aliud autem credentes haereticos reputamus.

cardinals. The intimidated prelates hereupon appealed to the Pope with the petition that he should withdraw his call for a Roman synod, and treat the King of France with more consideration.

The cardinals replied to the letters addressed to them,¹ and the Pope, in his writing “Verba delirantis filiae,” rebuked the weak prelates in a becoming manner. In August, 1302, Boniface held a consistory, at which the ambassadors who had brought the letter from the French clergy were also present. In the first place, the Cardinal Archbishop of Porto refuted the calumnies current among the people concerning Boniface VIII., and laid special stress on the fact that the king as a Christian must needs be subject to the Pope. Boniface then took up the word, and confirmed by express acknowledgment that there are two powers ordained of God,² as the cardinal had said.

As, after the disastrous battle near Courtray, the holding of the proposed council was most undesirable to Philip, and he failed in obtaining from Boniface the revocation of the bull which summoned the members together, he forbade in the most stringent manner that any of the French clergy should take the journey to Rome, and confiscated the property of such bishops and abbots as, in spite of his prohibition, should make the journey thither.

On the 30th of October, 1302, the council was opened at Rome. The result of the enactments was the celebrated bull “*Unam sanctam*,” in which the relation of the temporal to the spiritual power was lucidly explained without any special reference to France, and the obligation of every Christian, without any distinction, to submit to the Pope was dogmatically pronounced.

The negotiations between the Pope and Philip IV. still went on, as Boniface desired to settle the contention by kindness; and he deputed Cardinal John Le Moine of St. Marcellin (February, 1303) to make the requisite propositions to the king. But the king's

¹ To the complaint that the Pope considered himself supreme Feudal Lord, the cardinals replied: *Volumus vos pro certo tenere, quod Dominus noster Pontifex nunquam scripsit regi praedicto, quod de regno suo sibi subesse temporaliter illudque ab eo tenere deberet, et magister Jacobus archidiaconus Narb. notarius et nuntius, sicut constanter affirmat, ipsi Dom. regi hoc ipsum vel simile nunquam verbaliter nuntiavit aut scripto. Unde propositio, quam fecit Petrus Flotte, arenosum et falsum habuit fundamentum et ideo necesse est, quod cadat aedificium.*

² The Pope also again affirms, “*Dicimus, quod in nullo volumus usurpare jurisdictionem regis,*” and continues, on the other hand, “*Non potest negare rex seu qui-cunque alter fidelis, quin sit nobis subjectus ratione peccati.*” Compare on this allocution, *Hefele*, vi. 293 sqq., and *Hergenröther*, *Cath. Ch. and Chr. State*.

reply in no way satisfied the Pope. Even so he did not reject altogether the proposals made by the king, and was, as is shown by his letters to the cardinal legate of the 13th of April, resolved not to proceed to the last extremity against the king unless compelled by dire necessity. These letters were to be conveyed to the cardinal by the Archdeacon Benefract of Coutance, who was arrested by order of the king.

But the king was beforehand with the Pope. On the 12th of March he had held already a meeting of prelates and barons in the Louvre, at which William of Nogaret, the successor of the deceased Peter Flotte, brought forward the grossest calumnies against Boniface, without entering on a discussion of principles.

In this manner the contention assumed a purely personal character; it had become and retained the form of an attack on Boniface himself.

What had been begun by Nogaret was followed up and completed by the shameless knight William du Plessis, in June, 1303, at a second assembly of the clergy, barons, and jurists. This man repeated the old calumnies and added new ones. Thereupon the king and the assembly appealed to an oecumenical council and the future Pope. These resolutions, which on the 24th of June were announced to the people who were tarrying in the gardens of the Louvre, were also accepted by the prelates who were present, and who excused their cowardice with the remark that a general council was necessary for the justification of the Pope. The University of Paris, several ecclesiastical corporations, cities, etc., were induced, partly by persuasion, partly by force, to consent; while foreign powers were to be won over to the schismatical plan by royal letters.

As soon as Boniface was made aware of what had taken place in France, he, in a consistory held in August, 1303, at his native place (Anagni), purged himself by a solemn oath of the crimes imputed to him, and issued several bulls referring to his contest with Philip. Deferring for a while publicly to excommunicate the king by name, he yet ordered the bull "Super Petri solio" to be drawn up, in which sentence of excommunication was pronounced on the king, and his subjects absolved from their allegiance; but this bull was not to be published until September 8, and then only in case the king did not alter his mind. But the latter sought to be beforehand with the Pope by an act of brutality; he stirred up mutineers in Italy, who, headed by Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna, forced their way into the papal palace, plundered it, and even threatened

Boniface with death. The gray-headed aged Pope, who displayed an admirable heroism on this fearful occasion, had to suffer many insults and much ill-treatment at the hands of these ruffians, who intended to carry him away to France; on the third day, however, he was rescued by the inhabitants of Anagni. Boniface pardoned the criminals, with the exception of the murderers and traitors, and returned to Rome to find himself tyrannized over by the powerful family of the Orsini. Here the great Pope died,¹ Oct. 11, 1303; his death being hastened by the cruel treatment he had undergone.

Boniface had protected the Church in the north of Europe against the despotism of princes, and had regulated the succession to the throne in Hungary. It was unfortunate that he was unable to quell the wild disorders created by party strife in Italy. To settle the feuds between the Whites and the Blacks at Florence, he sent Charles of Valois as a mediator of peace; but this was a fatal mistake, and was the cause of many mortifications to him.

With an assiduity that was indefatigable, did Boniface labor for the spread of Christianity among the heathens and Mahometans. He intrusted this work to the Dominicans, to whom he granted full powers. They were also to reconcile the schismatic Greeks to the Church. His zeal for knowledge was manifested by the foundation of the "Sapienza" in Rome, and by other institutions of learning,² as also by the material support he afforded to the high-schools already existing, and the many privileges he granted them. To adorn the church of St. Peter, Boniface called the celebrated painter Giotto to Rome. He had hoped, with the help of the Khan Cazan of Persia, to free the Holy Land³ and introduce Christianity into the interior of Asia; this hope was frustrated by the indifferentism and egotism of princes who applied the money levied for the Crusades to other purposes. The Jubilee appointed by him in 1300 drew many thousands of pilgrims from all directions, from far and wide, to Rome. To the "Corpus juris canonici" he added the sixth book ("liber sextus"). Of his personal piety and his zeal for the worthy celebration of divine service, there are many splendid testimonies.

¹ The lie that Boniface, from despair or insanity, had torn his own flesh, is best disproved by the incorrupt state in which his body was found in 1605, when his bones were raised. See *Wiseman*, Treatise III. 185 sqq.

² At Fermo, Anagni, and other places, colleges or schools of learning were founded by Boniface.

³ Cf. *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1300, n. 33. *Tosti*, ii. 78 sqq.

If Boniface, whose majestic personal appearance was a faithful type of the interior qualifications of his mind, often encountered unfavorable judgments, both in his own and the succeeding time, this is partly attributable to the heat of party spirit, partly to insufficient knowledge of the state of things occasioned by the disturbances of Philip of France; it is also partly the result of the stand-point taken by the biographer, to view the action of this Pope, who amid the greatest tribulations stood firm, "because he had the truth on his side, and was battling for the right."¹

I. The bull "Unam sanctam" develops the following truths:—

According to the precept of faith, we must confess One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church; outside of which there is no salvation. She is the mystical body of Christ, prefigured in the ark of Noe and in the seamless vesture of the Lord Jesus (John xix. 23).

This one and only Church has one head, Christ, and his vicar, St. Peter and his successors, to whom the Savior intrusted all the faithful (John xxi. 17; x. 16).

In this Church and in her power are, according to the words of the Gospel (Luke xxii. 38), two swords, the spiritual and the temporal (Matt. xxvi. 52). The first is to be used *for* the Church; the latter, *by* the Church. The spiritual is to be used by the hand of the priest; the temporal, by the hand of the king, but according to the will of the priest, and as long as he suffers it. ("In hac ejusque potestate duos esse gladios: spiritualem videlicet et temporalem." . . .)

But (continues the bull) one of these swords must be under the other; that is, the temporal authority must be subordinate to the spiritual. ("Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio et temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subjici potestati.")

In proof of this assertion it is adduced: (1) That all powers are ordained by God (Rom. xiii. 1), which would not be the case, were not one sword under the other, and the under sword drawn upwards by the other; (2) That the prerogative of the spiritual over the material requires that its power should exceed that of the other in dignity.

After the Pope had quoted from Scripture some other texts in

¹ Si omnes principes terreni essent hodie colligati contra nos et contra ecclesiam istam (scl. Romanam), dum tamen nos haberemus veritatem et staremus pro veritate, appetriaremus eos unam festucam. Et sine dubio, si veritatem et justitiam non haberemus, bene timeremus. (Allegatio Bonif. VIII. pro confirm. Rege Rom. Alberto by de Marca, De concord. sac. et imp. ii. 3, p. 211, ed. Bamb. 1788.)

proof of this, and added some other reasons in behalf of his assertion, he proceeds to deduce the following conclusions :—

On account of its prerogative, the spiritual power has the office of teaching the temporal power, and to judge it if it is not good ; as is said by Jeremias (i. 10), (“*Nam veritate testante, spiritualis potestas terrenam instituere*¹ *habet et judicare, si bona non fuerit: sic de Eccl. et ecclesiastica potestate verificatur vaticinium Jeremiae: Ecce constituite hodie super gentes, et regna,*” etc.) When, then, the earthly or temporal power deviates from the right way, it is judged by the spiritual power ; and if the spiritual power deviates, the lower spiritual is judged by the higher ; but if the highest spiritual power deviates, it can be judged by God alone, and not by man.

The supreme authority, although given to and exercised by a man, is not a human but a divine authority, conferred on St. Peter and his successors by a divine decree (Matt. xvi. 19) ; and whoever resists the same, resists the ordinance of God.

After these expositions the Pope gives the following decision : “We declare, say, define, and announce that it is necessary to his salvation that every human creature is to be under the Pope” (“*Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus et diffinimus omnino esse de necessitate salutis*”).

II. As is seen from the contents of this bull, the Pope (1) does not claim a supreme feudal tenure over individual states or kingdoms, but he sets forth some principles as to the relation the spiritual bears to the temporal power, which are applicable to all Christian states, and were recognized by the public rights of that era. (2) Only the last sentence of the bull “*Porro,*” etc., is a dogmatical decision *ex cathedra*, which is deduced from the foregoing propositions.

III. The composer of the bull is probably *Ægidius* of Rome, Archbishop of Bourges, who borrowed his principal sentences from the writings of St. Bernard and of Hugh of St. Victor.

§ 124. *Retrospect.*

Notwithstanding the reverses which from human shortcomings and human passions the Church has undergone, both in her exterior and interior life, the period between 1073 and 1313 must ever be memorable and illustrious in ecclesiastical history. The Church, in

¹ On the meaning of the word *instituere*, see *Curd. Manning*, “*The Vatican Decrees, etc., . . . ; Hergenröther, Ch. Hist. iii. p. 263.*

the exercise of a wide-spread power and influence over the political and social affairs of Christian nations, cherished and cultivated within her bosom, science, art, religious worship and life, and brought all these things to a high standard of development.

The Crusades, called forth by the spirit of faith and piety, are a marvellous instance of the mighty influence exercised by the Church over the nations of Europe, and constitute one of the most glorious triumphs of Christianity.

The numerous Religious which sprung up at this time and found many adherents everywhere, rendered inestimable services in behalf of religion, morality, and social welfare. They were the ablest instruments of reform for the Popes, the most energetic opponents of heresies, the promoters of piety and charity, of art and science; they produced the brightest models of virtue, and administered to the various exigencies of Christian society.

The great institutions of learning, which grew so vastly in number and importance, present an incontestable evidence of the then prevailing love for science; and the writings of many schoolmen of that age bear illustrious testimony to the extent of their knowledge and the profundity of their thoughts.

Taken on the whole, it is the most flourishing and enjoyable period of the Middle Ages. The word spoken by Leo the Great respecting Rome was then realized: Rome, the ancient capital of the empire, had, by being the sacred seat of St. Peter and by her divine religion, become the head of the world, and possessed a far wider jurisdiction than she had ever known under her temporal rule of old. Christian peace had brought more subjects to her feet than ever the gigantic warfare of ancient times had done. In very fact, as Otho of Freising emphatically states, the city of God, which had been so lauded by St. Augustine, was at that era exteriorly elevated and glorified, as if God desired to show himself not only God of heaven, but of earth, that in this way the faithful might obtain a security and a foretaste of the promises regarding the hereafter.

The Church had acquired her freedom, and with it the supreme power in society; she used it for the purpose of subjugating to the laws of Christ individuals alike with nations. Neither under the seventh Gregory, nor under the third or fourth Innocent, nor under Boniface VIII., did she misuse that power; during the period of the hardest strife she promoted intellectual as well as moral progress.

Everything great achieved during this period, whether in art or science, whether in political, civil, or religious life, bore a thoroughly Christian stamp, and showed the ideal, aiming at the holy, the divine,—an ideal which brightly shone in the reflection of a supernatural life.

But the divinity of the Church could easily be forgotten in her exterior splendor; her power could be ascribed to the earthly means then placed at her disposal; and thus the ever-restless spirit of unbelief early found in the very glory of the ruling Church a fitting object for attack, and could feign a pious indignation over the “worldly-mindedness of the kingdom of God.”

Is it to be wondered at, that in later times we see the Church subjected to new conflicts, and that new and increasing exertions are made to cause her to return to a state of indigence and of exterior weakness, when these very exertions place her in a condition to test her strength, and to prove that she contains within herself the divine power of life?

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF POPES

FROM ST. PETER TO BONIFACE VIII.

St. Peter, 42-67.	St. Liberius, 352-366.
St. Linus, † 79.	Felix II., 355, anti-Pope? (Cf. § 58.)
St. Cletus (Anencletus, Anaclet.), † 91.	St. Damasus I., 366-384.
St. Clement I., † 100.	St. Siricius, 384-398.
St. Evaristus, † 108 or 109.	St. Anastasius I., 398-401.
St. Alexander I., † 117 or 119.	St. Innocent I., 402-417.
St. Xystus (Sixtus) I., † 126 or 128.	St. Zosimus, 417-418.
St. Telesphorus, † 137 or 139.	St. Boniface I., 418-422.
St. Hyginus, † 141 or 142.	St. Celestine I., 422-432.
St. Pius I., † 156 or 157.	St. Xystus (Sixtus) III., 432-440.
St. Anicetus, † 167 or 168.	St. Leo I. the Great, 440-461.
St. Soter, † 176 or 177.	St. Hilarius, 461-468.
St. Eleutherius, † 189 or 190.	St. Simplicius, 468-483.
St. Victor, † 201 or 202.	St. Felix III. (II.), 483-492.
St. Zephyrinus, † 218.	St. Gelasius, 492-496.
St. Callistus I., † 223.	St. Anastasius II., 496-498.
St. Urban I., † 230.	St. Symmachus, 498-514.
St. Pontianus, † 235.	St. Hormisdas, 514-523.
St. Anterus, 235-236.	St. John I., 523-526.
St. Fabianus, 236-250.	St. Felix IV. (III.), 526-530.
St. Cornelius, 251-253.	Boniface II., 530-532.
St. Lucius, 253-254.	John II., 532-535.
St. Stephen I., 254-257.	St. Agapetus I., 535-536.
St. Xystus (Sixtus) II., † 258.	Silverius I., 536-540, driven from Rome. (See § 63.)
St. Dionysius, 259-268.	Vigilius (537), 540-555.
St. Felix I., 269-274.	Pelagius I., 555-560.
St. Eutychianus, 275-283.	John III., 560-573.
St. Caius, 283-296.	Benedict I., 574-578.
St. Marcellinus, 296-304.	Pelagius II., 578-590.
St. Marcellus, 307-309.	St. Gregory I. the Great, 590-604.
St. Eusebius, † 309.	Sabinianus, 604-606.
St. Melchiades (Miltiad.), 310-314.	Boniface III., † 607.
St. Sylvester I., 314-335.	St. Boniface IV., 608-615.
St. Marcus, † 336.	St. Deusdedit, 615-618.
St. Julius, 337-352.	

Boniface V., 619-625.	Romanus, † 897.
Honorius I., 625-638.	Theodorus II., † 897 or 898 (reigned twenty days).
Severinus, † 640.	John IX., 898-900.
John IV., 640-642.	Benedict IV., 900-903.
Theodorus I., 642-649.	Leo V., † 903.
St. Martin I., 649-655.	Christopher, † 908. (Anti-Pope. See § 89.)
St. Eugene I., 655-657.	Sergius III., 903-911.
St. Vitalianus, 657-672.	Anastasius III., 911-913.
Adeodatus, 672-676.	Lando, † 914.
Donus, or Domnus, 676-678.	John X., 914-929.
St. Agatho, 678-681.	Leo VI., † 929.
St. Leo II., 682-683.	Stephen VII. (VIII.), 929-931.
St. Benedict II., 684-685.	John XI., 931-936.
John V., 685-686.	Leo VII., 936-939.
Conon, 686-687.	Stephen VIII. (IX.), 939-942.
St. Sergius I., 687-701.	Martin II., 943-946. (See § 122.)
John VI., 701-705.	Agapetus II., 946-955.
John VII., 705-707.	John XII., 955-964.
Sisinnius, † 708.	Leo VIII., 963-965. (Anti-Pope. See § 89.)
Constantine I., 708-715.	Benedict V., † 965.
St. Gregory II., 715-731.	John XIII., 965-972.
St. Gregory III., 731-741.	Benedict VI., 973-974.
St. Zacharias, 741-752.	(Boniface (Franco) VII., driven away, † 985. See § 89.)
Stephen II. (died in three days after election), † 752.	Benedict VII., 974-983.
Stephen II. (III.), 752-757.	John XIV., 983-984.
St. Paul I., 757-767.	(John XV., an intruder.)
(Constantine II., an intruder.)	John XV. (XVI.), 985-996.
Stephen III. (IV.), 768-772.	Gregory V., 996-999.
Adrian I., 772-795.	(John of Vicenza, anti-Pope, XVI.)
St. Leo III., 795-816.	Sylvester II., 999-1003.
Stephen IV. (V.), 816-817.	John XVII., † 1003.
St. Paschal I., 817-824.	John XVIII., 1003-1009.
Eugene II., 824-827.	Sergius IV., 1009-1012.
Valentine, † 827.	Benedict VIII., 1012-1024.
Gregory IV., 827-844.	John XIX., 1024-1033.
Sergius II., 844-847.	Benedict IX., 1033-1045.
St. Leo IV., 847-855.	Gregory VI., 1045-1046.
Benedict III., 855-858.	Clement II., 1046-1047.
St. Nicholas I., 858-867.	Damasus II., † 1048 (reigned twenty-three days).
Adrian II., 867-872.	St. Leo IX., 1049-1054.
John VIII., 872-882.	Victor II., 1054-1057.
Marinus I., 882-884. (See § 122.)	Stephen IX. (X.), 1057-1058.
Adrian III., † 885.	Benedict X. (not lawful Pope).
Stephen V. (VI.), 885-891.	Nicholas II., 1058-1061.
Formosus, 891-896.	Alexander II., 1061-1073.
Boniface, † 896 (reigned fifteen days).	
Stephen VI. or VII., † 897.	

(Honорий II., anti-Pope.)	Celestine III., 1191-1198.
St. Gregory VII., 1073-1085.	Innocent III., 1198-1216.
(Clement III., anti-Pope.)	Honorius III., 1216-1227.
Victor III., 1086-1087.	Gregory IX., 1227-1241.
Urban II., 1088-1099.	Celestine IV., † 1241.
Paschal II., 1099-1118.	Innocent IV., 1243-1254.
Gelasius II., 1118-1119.	Alexander IV., 1254-1261.
Calixtus II., 1119-1124.	Urban IV., 1261-1264.
Honorius II., 1124-1130.	Clement IV., 1265-1268.
Innocent II., 1130-1143.	St. Gregory X., 1271-1276.
(Anacletus II., anti-Pope.)	Innocent V., † 1276.
Celestine II., 1143-1144.	Adrian V., † 1276 (reigned thirty-nine days).
Lucius II., 1144-1145.	John XXI. (XX.), 1276-1277.
Eugene III., 1145-1153.	Nicholas III., 1277-1280.
Anastasius IV., 1153-1154.	Martin IV., 1281-1285.
Adrian IV., 1154-1159.	Honorius IV., 1285-1287.
Alexander III., 1159-1181.	Nicholas IV., 1288-1292.
Lucius III., 1181-1185.	St. Celestine V., 1294 (resigned, † 1296).
Urban III., 1185-1187.	Boniface VIII., 1294-1303.
Gregory VIII., † 1187.	
Clement III., 1187-1191.	

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF ECUMENICAL COUNCILS

FROM THE FIRST COUNCIL OF NICE TO THE SECOND
COUNCIL OF LYONS.

1. The First Council of Nice (325).
2. The First Council of Constantinople (381).
3. The Council of Ephesus (431).
4. The Council of Chalcedon (451).
5. The Second Council of Constantinople (553).
6. The Third Council of Constantinople (680).
7. The Second Council of Nice (787).
8. The Fourth Council of Constantinople (869).
9. The First Council in the Lateran (1023).
10. The Second Council in the Lateran (1036).
11. The Third Council in the Lateran (1179).
12. The Fourth Council in the Lateran (1215).
13. The First Council of Lyons (1245).
14. The Second Council of Lyons (1274).

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE
OF POPES, EMPERORS, AND IMPORTANT EVENTS,
FROM ST. PETER TO BONIFACE VIII.

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Nativity of Christ, 747 U. C., 7 before our Era. St. Peter, after Christ's ascension Head of the Church, 29 of our Era; in 44 taken prisoner and miraculously liberated; in 67, martyr together with St. Paul.	Octavianus Augustus, until 14 of our Era. Tiberius, 14-37. Caligula, 37-41. Claudius, 41-54. Nero, 54-68.	King Herod dies in the 3d year of our Era. Pontius Pilate, fifth Procurator in Judea. Death of St. Stephen. 37-40. Conversion of St. Paul. 44. James the Elder, martyr. 45. First mission of St. Paul. C. 51. Council of the Apostles. 52-56. Second and third mission of St. Paul. Between 61-64. James the Less, martyr. 66-70. Jewish war. Judaizing and Antinomian heretics. 70. Destruction of Jerusalem.
Linus (67-79?). Cletus, or Anaclete (79-91?).	Vespasian, 69-79. Titus, 79-81. Domitian, 81-96.	Christians at the imperial court. Persecution. 95. John at Patmos; then at Ephesus (96-100). Law against secret associations. Christians persecuted. Ignatius of Antioch and Simeon of Jerusalem, martyrs.
Clement I. (91-100?). Evaristus (101-109?). Alexander I., 109-111, al. 119.	Nerva, 96-98. Trajan, 98-117.	Development of Pagan gnosticism. Early Apologists. 132-135. Jewish insurrection.
Sixtus I. (Xystus), 117-127, al. 119-128.	Adrian, 117-138.	Justin the Philosopher. Attacks upon the Christian faith by Celsus, Crescent, Fronto (afterwards Lucian). Persecution of Christians. Polycarp of Smyrna, and many others in Gaul, martyrs. Legio fulminatrix.
Telesphorus, 128-138, al. 139. Hyginus (139-142?). Pius I., 142-151, al. -157. Anicete, 151-162, al. 157-168.	Antoninus Pius, 138-161. Marcus Aurelius, 161-180.	Apologists: Melito, Athenagoras, Claudius Apollinaris, and others. The Montanists. More lenient treatment of the Christians.
Soter (168-176).		Theodotus, heretic. 196. Controversy on the paschal feast between Victor and Polycrate. Vehement persecution in Africa, Egypt, Gaul, etc.
Eleutherus (177-190?).	Commodus, 180-193.	201. Tertullian, Montanist. 202. St. Irenæus, martyr.
Victor I., 190-202. Zephyrinus, 202-218.	Pertinax, Julian, Niger, 193. Septimius Severus, 193-211.	

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	Caracalla, 211-217. Macrinus, 217-218.	Flourishing condition of the Alexandrian school under Clement and Origen.
Callistus (Calixtus) I., 218-222. First anti-Pope (Hippolytus?). Urban I., 223-230. Pontian, 230-235.	Heliogabalus, 218-222.	Controversy on the Trinity and penance at Rome.
Anterus, Nov. 21, 235, to Jan. 3, 236. Fabian, 236-250.	Alexander Severus, 222-235.	Christians, though persecuted in some places, enjoy respect and protection, on the whole. Collection of the imperial rescripts by Ulpian.
Vacancy of eighteen months.	Maximinus Thrax, 235-238.	Severe persecution of the Christians.
Cornelius, † Sept. 14, 252, as martyr. Anti-Pope Novatian. Lucius I., 252-253. Stephen I., 253-257. Sixtus (Xystus) II., 257-258.	Pupienus Gordianus, 238. Gordianus, jr., 238-244. Philip Arabs, 244-249.	Ammonius Saccas. 244. Synod against Beryllus of Bostra. The Christians enjoy peace.
Dionysius, 259-269.	Decius, 250-251.	248. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. Severe persecution. Dissensions regarding the treatment of the fallen (lapsi).
Felix I., 269-274. Eutychian (275-283?). Cajus (283-296?).	Gallus and Volusianus, 251-253. Valerian, 253-260.	251. Paul of Thebes in the desert. † 254. Origen. 255-256. Controversy on baptism conferred by heretics. Persecution of Christians. † 258. Cyprian. Sixtus and Lawrence, martyrs.
Marcellinus, 296-304.	Gallienus, 260-268.	A kind of toleration edict for the Christians. Dionysius of Alexandria († 265) justifies himself at Rome. Synods against Paul of Samosata. † 270. Gregory Thaumaturgus.
Marcellus, 304-310.	Claudius II., 268-270. Aurelian, 270-275. Tacitus, 275-276. Probus, 276-282. Carus, 282-284. Diocletian, 284-305.	Manichaean heresy. New edict of persecution.
Eusebius, 310-311. Melchiades, 311-314.	Maximianus Herculeius, 285-310. Gallerius, 292-311.	Flourishing condition of the school at Antioch. 296. Edict against the Manicheans.
Sylvester, 314-335.	Constantius Chlorus, 292-306. Severus, 305-307. Maximinus, 305-313. Maxentius, 306-312. Licinius, 307-323. Constantine the Great, co-emperor, 306-323; sole ruler, 323-337.	302. Christianizing of Armenia. 303. Beginning of the severest persecution in the Roman Empire. 305-306. Synod at Elvira in Spain. 306. Beginning of the Meletian schism. 309. Martyrdom of Pamphilus. 311. Beginning of the Donatist schism. 312. Edict of toleration. 313. Edict of Milan. 314. Synod at Arles. 320. New persecution in the East by Licinius. 325. First Ecumenical Council at Nice. 326. Christianity in Iberia and Abyssinia. 330. Dedication of the new imperial city, Constantinople. Beginning of the Antiochian schism. † Lactantius. 335. Synod at Tyre. 336. Death of Arius. 342. Beginning of the persecution in Persia. 343. Synod at Sardica. 353. Orders to close the pagan temples.
Marcus, 336. Julius I., 337-352.	Constantine II., in Gaul, 337-340. Constans, 337-350, in Illyria and Italy. Constantius, in the East, 337-350; sole ruler, 350-361.	359. Synods at Seleucia and Rimini.
Liberius, 352-366. Felix II. (Anti-Pope?) 357.		

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Damasus, 366-384. Anti-Pope Ursicinus 366-367.	Julian the Apostate, 361-363. Jovian, 363-364. Valentinian I., 364-375. Valens, 364-378. Gratian, 375-383.	360. Elevation of Eudoxius to the See of Constantinople. 365. Synod of the Semi-Arians at Lampsacus. 367. Synod of the Semi-Arians at Tavara. 373. Death of St. Athanasius. 374. Condemnation of Apollinarianism at Rome. Persecution of the Catholics in the East. † 379. St. Basil. † 381. Ulfila, Bishop of the Goths. Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople. 385. Priscillian executed. Arian machinations at Milan. First papal decretals yet extant.
Siricius, 385-398.	Maximus Usurpator, 383-388. Valentinian II., 375-392, in the West. Theodosius the Great, 379-392, in the East; sole ruler, 392-395. Eugenius, usurper at Rome, 392.	† 386. Cyril of Jerusalem. † 389. Gregory Nazianzen. 394. Controversy on Origen. † 397. Ambrose of Milan.

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	ROMAN EMPERORS.		IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	IN THE WEST.	IN THE EAST.	
Anastasius I., 398-402. Innocent I., 402-417.	Honorius, 395-423.	Arcadius, 395-408. Theodosius II., 408-450.	401. Theophilus of Alexandria interdicts Origen's works. 403. Synodus ad quercum. † St. Epiphanius. † 407. John Chrysostom. 408-410. Rome repeatedly besieged, and finally taken by storm by Alaric. 411. Conference with the Donatists at Carthage. 417. Condemnation of Pelagius at Rome. 420. Death of St. Jerome. 429. Persecution of the Christians in Armenia. The Vandals in Africa. † Theodore of Mopsuestia. † 430. Augustine of Hippo. 431. Third (Ecumenical) Council at Ephesus. † 432. John Cassian. St. Patrick in Ireland. 433. Reconciliation between Cyril and John of Antioch. 438-440. Publication of the Codex Theodosianus. † 446-447. Proclus of Constantinople; Flavian his successor. 449. Robber synod at Ephesus. 450. The Anglo-Saxons in England.
Zosimus, 417-418. Boniface I., 418-422. Eulalius, Anti-Pope. Celestine I., 422-432.	Valentinian III., 423-455.	Marcian, 450-457.	
Sixtus III., 432-440.			
Leo I. the Great, 440-461.			

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	ROMAN EMPERORS.		IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	IN THE WEST.	IN THE EAST.	
Hilarus, 461-468. Simplicius, 468-483.	<i>By name:—</i> Max Avitus, 455; Majorian, 457; Libius Severus, 461; and others, until	Leo I., 457-474.	451. Fourth Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon. 452. Attila threatens Italy. 455. Genseric plunders Rome. † 457. Theodoret of Cyrus. Timotheus Airolos raised to the See of Alexandria; he is expelled (460) and superseded by Timotheus Salophakialos. † 463. Prosper of Aquitania. † 471. Gennadius of Constantinople. Acarius becomes his successor. 476. Encyclion. 477. Anti-Eucalyelion. 482. Henoticon. † 483. Euric, King of the Visigoths in Gaul. 484. Beginning of the Acacian schism. New persecution of the Catholics in Africa. 489. Closing of the school of Edessa. 490. Fanstus, Bishop of Rhegium. 496. Baptism of Clovis, King of the Franks.
Felix III. (properly II.), 483-492.	Romulus Augustus, 476, last West-Roman Emperor. Odoacer, King of Italy, 476-493. Dominion of the Ostrogoths in Italy under Theodoric, † 526.	Zeno, 474-476. Basiliscus, 476-477. Zeno, ruler again, 477-491.	499. Nestorian Synod in Persia. 503. Synodus palmaris at Rome. 511. First Synod of Orleans; death of Clovis.
Gelasius, 492-496. Anastasius II., 496-498. Symmachus, 498-514. Laurentius, anti-Pope, 498-501.		Anastasius, 491-518.	

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EAST-ROMAN EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Hormisdas, 514-523.		517. Sigismund, King of Burgundy, became a Catholic. 518. Termination of the Acacian schism.
John I., 523-525.	Justin I., 518-527.	
Felix IV. (properly III.), 526-530.	Justinian I., 527-565.	527. Thuringia united to the Frankish kingdom. 529. Suppression of the Neo-Platonic school at Athens. Second Synod of Orange against the Semi-Pelagians.
Boniface II., 530-532.		533. Termination of the dominion of the Vandals in Africa. 534. Burgundy united to the Frankish kingdom.
John II., 533-535.		536. Anthimus of Constantinople deposed by the Pope. † 543. St. Benedict of Nursia.
Agapet, 535-536.		544, 551. Dogmatical edicts of Justinian.
Silverius, 536-540.		553. Fifth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople.
Vigilius, 540-554.		555. Termination of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in Italy.
Pelagius I., 555-560.	553. Italy East-Roman province.	568. The Lombards under Alboin in Upper Italy.
John III., 560-573.	Justin II., 565-574.	571. Beginning of a long war between East Romans and Persians.
Benedict I., 574-578.	Tiberius, 574-582.	574, 575. Anarchy in the Lombard kingdom. Thirty-six Dukes.

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EAST-ROMAN EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Pelagius II., 578-590.	Mauritius, 582-602.	† 577. John III., the Scholastic, at Constantinople. 580. Persecution of the Catholics in Spain by the Arians.
Gregory the Great, 590-604.	Phocas, 602-610.	582. The ambitious John IV. (the Faster), Patriarch of Constantinople. 589. Third Synod at Toledo (Filioque).
Sabinian, 604-605.		† 595. Gregory, Bishop of Tours.
Boniface III., 606.	Heraclius, 610-641.	596. Abbot Augustine sent to England. 610. The Roman Pantheon transformed into a Christian church.
Boniface IV., 607-614.		613. Chlothar I. unites the various realms of the Frankish dominion. St. Gall in Switzerland. 615. General Synod at Paris. Columbanus †.
Deusdedit, 615-618.		616-619. Origin of Monothelitism.
Boniface V., 619-625.		† 625. Theodelinda, Queen of the Lombards.
Honorius I., 625-638.		629. Exaltation of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem. 632. Death of Mohammed.
Severinus, 638-640.		633. Cyrus of Alexandria unites the Theodosians with his church. † 636. Isidore of Seville.
John IV., 640-642.	Constantine III., Heraclius, and Heraclenias, 641.	637. Capturing of Jerusalem by the Arabs. 638. Capturing of Antioch. Ecthesis. Sergius of Constantinople †.
Theodore I., 642-649.	Constans II., 642-668.	639. Pyrrhus of Constantinople confirms Monothelitism. 641. Alexandria taken by the Arabs.
St. Martin II., 649-655.		642. Resignation of Pyrrhus of Constantinople. Paul II. his successor.
Eugene I., 654-657.		648. Dogmatical edict, or the <i>Tupos</i> of Constans.
Vitalian, 657-672.		649. Lateran Synod under Martin.
Adeododat II., 672-676.	Constantine IV. (Pogonatus), 668-685.	655. Pyrrhus once more Patriarch of Constantinople.
Donnus, or Donus, 676-678.		† 658. Eligius of Noyon.
St. Agatho, 678-681.		662. St. Maximus †. Grimoald, King of the Lombards.
St. Leo II., 682-683.	Justinian II., 685-695.	† 667. Ildephonse of Toledo.
Benedict II., 684-686.		680. Sixth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople.
John V., 686.		681. Twelfth Synod of Toledo.
Conon, 687.	Leontius, 695-698.	684. Constantine, chief of the Paulicians, put to death.
St. Sergius, 687-701.	Tiberius II., 698-705.	690. Theodore of Canterbury and Julian of Toledo †. St. Willibord among the Frisians.
John VI., 701-705.	Justinian II. (once more), 705-711.	692. Trullan Council at Constantinople.
John VII., 705-707.	Philippicus Bardanes, 711-713.	696. Carthage taken by the Arabs.
Sisinnius, 708.	Anastasius II., 713-715.	710. Pope Constantine at Constantinople.
Constantine, 708-715.	Theodosius III., 715-716.	711. Spain conquered by the Arabs. Short triumph of the Monothelites in the East.
Gregory II., 715-731.	Leo III., the Isaurian, 716-741.	† 714. Pepin of Heristal.
Gregory III., 731-741.		723. Winfried (St. Boniface) becomes Bishop.
		726. Beginning of the Iconoclastic struggle in the East.
		730. Removal of Patriarch Germanus. Corbinian †.
		732. Winfried (St. Boniface), Archbishop. Victory of Charles Martel near Poitiers.
		733. Illyria separated from the Roman patriarchate.

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EAST-ROMAN EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Zachary, 741-752.	Constantine (Copronymus), 741-775.	735. Venerable Bede †. 739. New division of the dioceses of Bavaria. 741. Charles Martel †. Four bishoprics founded by Boniface. First German Council. 745. Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz. 747. Pepin's brother, Carloman, enters a monastery. 752. Childeric III deposed. Pepin King. 753. The Pope travels to the Franks. 754. Council of the Iconoclasts at Constantinople. Treaty of Chiersy. St. John Damascene †. 755. St. Boniface † as a martyr. 768. Charlemagne ascends the Frankish throne. 772-784. Wars with the Saxons.
Stephen II. (3 days). Stephen III., 752-757.		
Paul I., 757-767. Anti-Popes Constantine II., 767, and Philip. Stephen IV., 768-772. Adrian I., 772-795.		

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.		IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	WEST ROMAN.	EAST ROMAN.	
Leo III., 795-816.	Restoration of the West-Roman Empire, 800.	Leo IV., 775-780. Irene and Constantine VI., 780-790.	774. End of the Lombard kingdom in Italy. 782. Synod at Seville against Migenius. 787. Seventh Ecumenical Council at Nice.
Stephen V., 816-817.	Charlemagne, 800-814.	Constantine VI. (alone), 790-797.	792. Synod at Ratisbon. 794. Synod at Frankfort. 799. Synod at Aix-la-Chapelle.
Paschal I., 817-824.	Louis the Mild, 814-840.	Irene (again), 797-802.	803. Termination of the wars with the Saxons. † 804. Alcuin.
Eugene II., 824-827.		Nicephorus, 802-811.	809. Synod at Aix-la-Chapelle.
Valentine, † 827 (40 days).		Michael I., 811-813.	817. Monastic reform of St. Benedict of Aniane († 821). Second controversy on images.
Gregory IV., 827-844.		Leo V., 813-820.	† 818. Felix of Urgel.
Sergius II., 844-847.		Michael II., 820-829.	825. Synod at Paris.
Leo IV., 847-855.		Theophilus, 829-842.	† 826. Theodore the Studite.
Benedict III., 855-858.	Louise II., 850-875.	Theodora and Michael III., 842-856.	829. Ansgar in Denmark and Sweden.
Anti-Pope Anastasius, 855.		Michael III., 856-867.	† 840. Agobard of Lyons and Claudius of Turin.
Nicholas the Great, 858-867.			842. Feast of Orthodoxy with the Greeks.
			843. Treaty of Verdun. Jonas of Orleans †.
			846. Rome threatened by the Saracens.
			849. Synod of Chiersy against Gottschalk. Walafried Strabot.
			850 sqq. Persecution of Christians in Spain.
			855. Synod at Valence.
			† 856. Rabanus Maurus.
			857. Ignatius of Constantinople deposed. Photius, Patriarch.
			865. Pascharius Radbert, and Ausgar †.

POPES ; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.		IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	WEST ROMAN.	EAST ROMAN.	
Adrian II., 867-872.		Basil I., 867-886.	869. Eighth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople. St. Cyril†. 871. Victory of Emperor Basil over the Paulicians.
John VIII., 872-882.	Charles II., 875-877.		877. Photius (again) Patriarch, 879; Synodus Photiana. † 882. Hincmar of Rheims. † 885. St. Methodius.
Marinus, 882-884.	Charles III., 881-	Leo the Wise, 886-	886. Second deposition of Photius. 888. Reformatory Synods at Metz and Meintz.
Adrian III., 884-885.	888.	912.	† 891. Photius. 895. Synod at Tribur.
Stephen VI., 885-891.	Guido, 891.		871-901. Alfred the Great, King of England, delivers his country from the yoke of the Danes (880), and carries out wholesome reforms.
Formosus, 891-896.	Lambert, 892-898.		898. Synod at Ravenna.
Boniface VI. (fifteen days).			
Stephen VII., 896-897.	Arnulph, 896-899.		
Romanus (four months).			
Theodore II., 898.			
John IX., 898-900.			
Benedict IV., 900-903.	Louis III., of Provence, 901-902.		905. Marozia marries Alberic I. 909. Synod of Trosly. 910. Berno founds the monastery of Clugny.
Leo V. (one month).			911. Louis the Child.
Christopher, 904.			
Sergius III., 904-911.			
Anastasius III., 911-913.		Alexander, 912-913.	
Lando, 913, to April, 914.			
John X., 914-923.	Berengarius of Friuli, 914-924.	Constantine VII., under guardian, 912-919; together with Romanus I., 919-944; alone, 944-959.	925. Alberic I. Marozia marries Guido of Tuscany. 929. Guido of Tuscany. Marozia and her son Alberic II. rule in Rome.
Leo VI. (seven months).			932. Marozia in third marriage with King Hugh, who was, however, expelled from Rome. 936. Otho I., German King. † 940. Unni, Archbishop of Hamburg.
Stephen VIII., 929-931.			946. Peace between King Hugh and Alberic II. † 947. King Hugh.
John XI., 931-936.			951. Otho I. in Upper Italy. 955. Olga of Russia baptized at Constantinople.
Leo VII., 936-939.			960. Atto of Vercelli.
Stephen IX., 939-942.			966. Wenceslaus of Poland baptized.
Marinus II., 943-946.			967. Otho II. crowned emperor. 968. Magdeburg archbishopric.
Agapete, 946-956.			969. The Council of London. 972. Geisa, Duke of Hungary, converted.
John XII., 956-964.	Otho I., 962-973.	Romanus II., 959-963.	973. Bishopric of Prague founded.
Leo VIII., Anti-Pope, 963-965.		Nicephorus Phocas, 963-969.	† 974. Ratherins, Bishop of Verona.
Benedict V., 964.			982. Greenland discovered.
John XIII., 965-972.		John Tzimisees, 969-976.	
Benedict VI., 973.	Otho II., 973-983.	Basil II., and Constantine VIII., 976-1025.	
Boniface VII., Anti-Pope, 974.			
Benedict VII., 975-984.			

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.		IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	WEST ROMAN.	EAST ROMAN.	
John XIV., 984-985. John XV., 985-996.			† 984. Hroswitha. 987. Hugh Capet, King of France. 988. St. Dunstan†. Wladimir christianizes the Russians. 993. Ulric, Bishop of Augsburg, canonized by Pope John XV. † 997. St. Adalbert of Prague. 998. Gerbert, Archbishop of Ravenna. 1000. Christianity in Iceland and Greenland. † 1002. Olaf Trygvesen. † 1004. Abbo of Fleury. † 1005. St. Nihil. † 1008. Bernard of Menthone.
Gregory V., 996-999 (first German Pope). John XVI., Anti-Pope, 997 sqq. Sylvester II. (Gerbert, first French Pope), 999-1003. John XVII., 1003. John XVIII., 1003-1008. Sergius IV., 1009-1012. Benedict VIII., 1012-1024. Anti-Pope Gregory, 1012. John XIX., 1024-1032. Benedict IX., 1033-1044. Anti-Pope Sylvester III., 1044. Gregory VI., 1044-1046. Clement II., 1046-1047. Damascus II., 1048. St. Leo IX., 1049-1054. Victor II., 1055-1057. Stephen X., 1057-1058. Benedict X., Anti-Pope, 1058. Nicholas II., 1059-1061. Alexander II., 1061-1073. Anti-Pope Honorius II., 1061-1072.	Otho III., 996-1002. Henry I. (as King, II.), 1014-1024. Conrad I. (as King, II.), 1027-1039. Henry II. (III.), 1046-1056. Imperial dignity vacant (King Henry IV. of Germany, 1056-1106).		1014. Canute the Great of Denmark. † 1015. Harduin of Ivrea as monk. † 1022. Notker Labeo. † 1027. St. Romuald. 1028. Fulbert of Chartres †. Guido of Arezzo. 1031. Synod of Limoges : Treuga Dei. † 1038. St. Stephen of Hungary. 1046. Synod at Sutri. † 1048. St. Odilo of Clugny. 1050. Synod against Berengarius. 1054. Rupture between Rome and Byzantium. Council at Tours. 1059. Roman Synod. Decree on papal election. Robert Guiscard, vassal of the Roman See. 1066. England occupied by William the Conqueror. Gottschalk, King of the Wends, assassinated. 1070. Lanfranc becomes bishop of Canterbury. † 1072. Peter Damian. 1074 sqq. Synods held by order of Gregory VII. 1076. Pseudo-synod at Worms. Diet at Tribur. 1077. Henry IV. at Canossa. Lambert of Hersfeld†. † 1080. Rudolph of Suabia. 1084. Henry IV. at Rome. † 1087. Lanfranc. † 1088. Berengarius.
Gregory VII., 1073-1085.		Michael Parapinakes, 1072-1078.	
Anti-Pope Clement III., 1080-1100.		Nicephorus Botoniates, 1078-1081.	
Victor III., 1086-1087.		Alexius Comnenus, 1081-1118.	

POPES ; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.		IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	WEST ROMAN.	EAST ROMAN.	
Urban II., 1088-1099.			1089. Bishop Bonizo assassinated at Piacenza. † 1091. William, Abbot of Hirsau. 1092. Synod of Soissons. 1093. Revolt of Conrad against his father, Henry IV. 1095. Synods at Piacenza and Clermont. 1096. First crusade. 1097. Nice taken. 1098. Antioch. 1093-1109. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury. 1098. Synod of Buri, in Apulia. 1099. Jerusalem taken. † 1100. Godfrey of Bouillon. Synod of Melfi. 1107. Synod of Troyes. † 1109. Anselm of Canterbury. 1111. Treaty of Sutri. 1112, 1116. Lateran Synods.
Paschal II., 1099-1118. Anti-Popes:— Theodoric, 1100; Alberic, 1102; Maginulf, 1105 sqq.	Henry (V. in Germany), 1111-1125.	John II. Comnenus, 1118-1143.	1119. Synod at Rheims. 1121. Synod of Soissons against Abelard. Vicelin among the Obotrites. 1122. Concordat of Worms. 1123. Ninth Ecumenical Council (Lat. I.). 1124. Peter of Bruys burnt. Tanhelm. † Stephen of Tigerno. 1127, 1128. Sentence of excommunication on Conrad, anti-king. † 1134. St. Norbert and Hildebert of Mans. 1135. Rupert of Deutz.
Gelasius II., 1118. Calixtus II., 1118-1124. Burdinus (Gregory VIII.), anti-Pope.		Lothaire II., 1133-1137.	1139. Tenth Ecumenical Council (Lat. II.). † Otho of Bamberg. 1140. Synods at Sens (against Abelard) and at Jerusalem. † 1141. Hugh of St. Victor. † 1142. Abelard. 1143. Arnold of Brescia at Rome.
Honorius II., 1124-1130.		Manuel Comnenus, 1143-1180.	1146. Edessa is lost. 1147. Second crusade. 1148. Synod at Rheims. 1150-1151. Decretum Gratiani. † 1153. St. Bernard and Robert Pulleine. † 1154. Gilbert Porretanus. 1155. Arnold of Brescia put to death. † 1156. Petrus Venerabilis. Peace of Benevento. 1157. Christianity in Finland. Diet of Besançon. 1158. Diet of Roncaglia. † Wibald of Stabio. Adrian's bull concerning Ireland (C. 1155)
Innocent II., 1130-1143. Anti-Pope Anacletus II., 1130-1138.	Lothaire II., 1133-1137.		
Celestine II. (six months). Lucius II., 1144-1145. Eugene III., 1145-1153.			
Anastasius IV., 1153-1154. Adrian IV. (an Englishman), 1154-1159.	Frederic I., 1155-1190.		

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.		IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	WEST ROMAN.	EAST ROMAN.	
Alexander III., 1159-1181. Anti-Popes: Victor IV., 1159-1164; Paschal III., 1164-1168; Calixtus III., 1168-1177; Innocent III., 1178-1180.			1160. Pseudo-synod at Pavia. 1163. Synod at Tours. † 1164. Peter Lombard. 1165. Diet at Würzburg. † 1166. William I. of Sicily; William II., successor. 1167. Lombard League. 1168. Rügen conquered by Waldemar of Denmark. Alessandria. † 1169. Gerhoch of Reichersberg. 1170. Thomas à Becket martyred. Petrus Waldus. † 1173. Richard of St. Victor. 1176. Battle of Legnano. 1177. Peace of Venice. 1179. Eleventh Ecumenical Council (Lat. III.). Portugal a kingdom. 1182. John of Salisbury †. Union of the Maronites with Rome. Assassination of Franks at Constantinople. 1183. Peace of Constance. 1184. Synod of Verona. 1185. Thessalonica conquered by the Franks. 1186. Marriage of Henry (VI.) with Constantia of Sicily. Meinhard preaching in Livonia. 1187. Jerusalem conquered by Saladin. 1189. Third crusade. William II. of Sicily †. 1190. Tancred, King of Sicily. 1191. Capture of St. Jean d'Acre. 1192. Richard Cœur de Lion taken prisoner near Vienna. 1194. King Tancred †. Frederic II. born. Eustathius of Thessalonica †. 1198. Empress Constance †. Double election in Germany between Philip of Suabia and Otho. 1200. Bishopric of Riga established. 1202. Fulco of Neuilly and Joachim de Floris †. Order of the Brothers of the Sword. † 1203. Alanus of Ryssel (ab Insulis).
Lucius III., 1181-1185.	Alexius II., Comnenus, 1180-1183.		
Urban III., 1185-1187.	Andronicus II., Comnenus, 1183-1185. Isaac Angelus, 1185-1195.		
Gregory VIII., 1187.			
Clement III., 1187-1191.	Henry (VI.) 1191-1197.	Alexius III., 1195-1203.	
Celestine III., 1191-1198.			
Innocent III., 1198-1216.	Alexius IV. and V., 1203.		

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.			IMPORTANT EVENTS.	
	ROMAN.	SINCE 1204.			
		LATIN.	GREEK.		
Honorius III., 1216-1227.		Baldwin I., 1204-1205.	Theodore I., Lascaris, 1204-1222.	1204. Latin Empire (1204-1261). Amalric of Bena †. † 1205. Peter of Poitiers, Archbishop of Embrun. 1208. Philip of Suabia assassinated. 1209. Crusade against the Albigenses. Synod at Paris against the sect of the Free Spirit. John, King of England, excommunicated. 1212. The "Pauperes Catholici" approved. 1212-1213. Children's crusade. 1215. Twelfth Ecumenical Council (Lat. IV.).	
Otho IV., 1209- 1218.		Henry, 1205- 1216.		1217. Crusade of Andrew, King of Hungary. 1219. Damietta recovered, but lost again (1221). † 1221. St. Dominic. † 1226. St. Francis. 1227. Frederic II. excommunicated. 1228. Frederic's crusade. 1229. Synod of Toulouse. Termination of the wars with the Albigenses. 1230. Peace of St. Germano. The Teutonic Order in Prussia. † 1231. St. Elizabeth of Thuringia and Anthony of Padua. † 1233. Elias of Cortona. 1235. King Henry revolts against his father Frederic	
Gregory IX., 1227-1241.	Frederic II., 1220-1250.	Peter of Courtenay, 1216- 1217. Robert of Courtenay, 1217- 1228.	John Dukas, 1222-1255.		
		Baldwin II., 1228-1261.	Theodore II., 1255-1259. John D. Vatatzes negotiates with the Latins, 1232- 1235.		

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EAST-ROMAN EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Celestine IV. (two weeks). Vacancy. Innocent IV., 1243- 1254.		1239. Frederic II. again excommunicated. Christians defeated near Ascalon. 1244. Defeat of the Christians near Gaza. 1245. Thirteenth Ecumenical Council at Lyons. Alexander of Hales †. 1246. The Order of the Humbled ("Humiliati") approved. 1247. Henry Raspe †. William of Holland elected German King. 1248. Defeat of Frederic II. at Parma. † 1249. William of Auvergne. 1250. St. Louis taken prisoner by the Saracens. † 1253. St. Clara of Assisi, and Bishop Robert of Lincoln.

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EAST- ROMAN EMPERORS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Alexander IV., 1254-1261.		<p>1254. Conrad IV. (since 1252 in Italy) †. Return of St. Louis to France. "Evangelium aeternum" condemned.</p> <p>1256. William of Holland †. Double election in Germany. Augustinian Hermits. † 1257. St. Hyacinth.</p> <p>1258. Manfred crowned king.</p> <p>1260. Hugo de St. Caro (author of the first concordance) †. Procession of the Flagellants in Italy.</p>
Urban IV., 1261-1264.	Michael Palæologus takes Constantinople, 1261-1281.	<p>1264. Vincent of Beauvais †. The Feast of Corpus Christi instituted.</p> <p>1266. Charles of Anjou crowned King of Sicily. Manfred †.</p>
Clement IV., 1265-1268. Vacancy two and a half years.		<p>† 1267. Sylvester Guzelino.</p> <p>1268. Battle near Tagliacozzo. Conradi, the last of the Hohenstaufens, beheaded.</p> <p>† 1270. St. Louis (IX.).</p> <p>† 1272. William of St. Amour and Berthold of Ratisbon.</p>
Gregory X., 1271-1276.		<p>1273. Raymond of Pennafort †. Rudolph of Hapsburg, German king.</p> <p>1274. Fourteenth Ecumenical Council at Lyons. St. Thomas † and St. Bonaventure †.</p> <p>1275. John (XI.) Beccos, Patriarch of Constantinople.</p> <p>1279. Bull on the Franciscan Order.</p> <p>† 1280. Albert the Great.</p>
Innocent V., June, 1276 †.	Andronicus II., 1282-1328.	<p>1282. Sicilian Vespers. Recantation of the Union on the part of the Greeks.</p> <p>1283. Prussia subdued by the Teutonic Order.</p> <p>† 1284. Charles I. of Naples.</p> <p>† 1286. Raymond Martini.</p> <p>1287. Laodicea and Tripolis conquered by the Sultan of Egypt.</p> <p>1289. Charles II. of Naples delivered.</p>
Adrian V., thirty-nine days.		<p>1291. Rudolph of Hapsburg †. Adolph of Nassau, King. Fall of Acre. John of Monte Corvino in China.</p>
John XX. (XXI.), May, 1277 †.		<p>† 1294. Roger Bacon.</p>
Nicholas III., 1277-1280.		<p>1296. Bull "Clericis laicos."</p>
Martin IV., 1281-1285.		<p>† 1297. Peter of Oliva.</p>
Honorius IV., 1285-1287.		<p>1298. Beccos † in exile. Adolph of Nassau †. Albert of Austria, King. Armistice between France and England. Papal decision. Liber sextus.</p>
Nicholas IV., 1288-1292.		<p>1300. First Jubilee.</p>
Vacancy of twenty-seven months.		<p>1301. Bull "Ausculta fili."</p>
Celestine V., August until December, 1294.		<p>1302. French national assembly and Roman Synod. Bull "Unam sanctam."</p>
Boniface VIII., 1294-1303.		<p>1303. Assault upon the Pope at Anagni.</p>



1 1012 01277 1434

Date Due

S 1 - '43

AN 13 '50

FE 4 '52

FE 18 '51

FE 29 '52



